

THE CLERGY REVIEW

Chairman of the Editorial Board:
Most Reverend Archbishop Downey

Editor:
Very Reverend Canon G. D. Smith, D.D., Ph.D.

The Editor is always ready to consider articles which may be of interest to the Clergy, but such articles should be typewritten, with double spacing. We also invite our readers to propose for solution cases in Moral Theology, Canon Law, Liturgy, or other departments of sacred science, and we hope that they will not hesitate to contribute to our Correspondence pages their views on the solution of such cases or on any other matter which falls within the scope of THE CLERGY REVIEW.

Matter offered for publication may be sent direct, to save time to the Editor at St. Edmund's College, Old Hall, Ware, Herts.

Other correspondence should be sent to the Manager,

THE CLERGY REVIEW
BURNS OATES & WASHBOURNE LTD.
6 GREAT NEW STREET, LONDON, E.C.4

Subscription Rates for twelve monthly numbers:

£1 OR FIVE DOLLARS POST FREE
SINGLE NUMBERS TWO SHILLINGS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OCTOBER 1940

ARTICLES

PAGE

- (1) Anti-clericalism. The legitimate and the illegitimate 283
By F. R. Hoare.
- (2) Angels in the Liturgy 295
By Dom Romanus Rios, O.S.B.
- (3) Priests and Matrimonial Dispensations . . . 306
By Rev. William Dunne, B.A.
- (4) A Point of Lucan Style 318
By Rev. Edmund F. Sutcliffe, S.J.

HOMILETICS

- The Sundays of November 323
By Rev. H. E. Calnan, D.D.

DOCTRINE FOR CHILDREN

- Lessons for November 332
By Rev. Francis H. Drinkwater

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

- (1) Dogmatic Theology 340
By Very Rev. Canon G. D. Smith, D.D.,
Ph.D.
- (2) Philosophy 347
By Rev. R. P. Phillips, D.D., M.A.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

- (1) "Scribere" in Canon 1386 §1 352
- (2) Diocesan Collections 355
- (3) Orationes pro Defunctis 357
- (4) Duplication in Convent Chapel 357
- (5) Christian Name in Adult Baptism 359
- (6) Ex-Religious in Minor Orders 360
By Very Rev. Canon E. J. Mahoney, D.D.

ROMAN DOCUMENTS 363

CHURCH MANAGEMENT 369

BOOK REVIEWS 371

CORRESPONDENCE 374

The CLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES.

VOL. XIX, No. 4.

OCTOBER, 1940

ANTI-CLERICALISM

THE LEGITIMATE AND THE ILLEGITIMATE

(i)

THE British Government recently framed a new Constitution for Malta. With obvious reference to the episode of ten years ago they included in it a stipulation that the legislature should contain no "ministers of religion", which, for all practical purposes in Malta, meant priests.

This stipulation will seem obviously right to Liberals, in spite of the fact that the choice of priests as representatives was the free act of the Maltese people when they enjoyed the political liberties identified with Liberalism. It will commend itself also to the dictators of the totalitarian States, who take the strictest measures, in Concordats and outside them, to prevent priests from entering politics. And in enthusiastic union with these strange bed-fellows there are great numbers of Catholics in all countries, and perhaps particularly in England, who secretly or openly approve all such measures. Indeed, up to a certain point and in existing circumstances, their attitude can claim the support of weighty arguments and even of Papal authority.

But the qualifying phrases "up to a certain point and in existing circumstances" are indispensable if this attitude of many Catholics is to remain a Catholic attitude, and these qualifications are all too often missing. The *de facto* alliance, on this issue, of anti-clerical Catholics with secularists, both Liberal and totalitarian, reflects, in most cases, confusion in the minds of the Catholics in question concerning the boundary line between anti-clericalism and secu-

larism. Beginning with a lawful objection to the personal participation of priests in the machinery of political action, these Catholics are beguiled by their allies and by their own mental laziness into the declaration that the Church has no business with politics. But the first position is compatible with a full acceptance of the authority of the priestly office and of the whole Catholic faith; and the second position is at variance both with the authoritative practice of the Church in all periods of her history and with solemn and irreversible pronouncements in the sphere of morals.

Anti-clericalism, therefore, which may be defined as opposition to the influence of the clergy in everyday affairs, and particularly in politics, is a singularly unsuitable topic for the easy jests and cynicisms in which even flamingly orthodox Catholics frequently see fit to indulge when it is broached. The light-hearted enunciation of such slogans as, "I take my religion from Rome and my politics from home", and "You must be an anti-clerical in order to be a good Catholic", does not necessarily convict the speaker of anything worse than an undue sacrifice of accuracy to epigram or carelessness in the matter of giving edification. But it may conceal an erroneous outlook upon the functions of the teaching Church; and, though the theological error may be for the moment unconscious and merely material, he who holds it and habitually acts upon it is in grave danger until it has been brought to his notice and formally disavowed.

(ii)

The unrestricted anti-clericalism which denies to priests any part in politics at all may fairly be called erroneous because it strikes at one of the essential functions of the teaching Church, namely to pass moral judgements. It is true that it can be made to

appear consistent with the acknowledgment of the Church's general commission to act as arbiter of morals, but only by pretending that moral questions do not arise in politics, and this proposition is demonstrably false.

Doubtless the bulk of the problems which occupy politicians, including some of the largest constitutional questions, are merely technical, being concerned with forms of government, methods of administration, economic processes and the like. But there is an ethical background to all of them, and there are few of them that are not liable at any moment to raise a clear issue of moral right and wrong.

This is partly because the very existence of political communities is for an ethical purpose, namely to make possible the corporate life which is natural to man and in which the natural moral virtues are best practised. Partly it is because the actors in politics are human beings, every deliberate act of whom is subject to moral judgement, no matter in what sphere it takes place. All the attempts to represent the State as a non-moral entity, or as a law to itself, cannot alter the truth that it has a moral end beyond itself, namely to serve on the temporal plane the eternal end of man ; and all the attempts to represent political action as, so to speak, dehumanized by reason of its collective character, or because the statesman is a trustee or agent for an impersonal sovereignty, break down over the individual person's responsibility to his conscience when performing any action ultimately directed towards a moral end.

There is no need to elaborate or substantiate these propositions here. They are, after all, the common-places of Catholic moral and political philosophy and most of them were enunciated by Aristotle before the Church existed, in the light of natural reason alone. They are set down in the present context because

they constitute the charter of the Church's official rôle in politics. Indeed, it could be shown that all the principal forms which her action toward the State has taken, from her protest through her martyrs against the Caesar-worship of the pagan Empire down to the quasi-theocratic rule of St. Gregory VII or Pope Innocent III, and thence to the political Encyclicals of Leo XIII and Pius XI, can be expressed in terms of them.

It is for the sake of the principles which they embody that she has, times without number, in every variety of temporal fortune and political setting and over every topic of political life—civil obedience, religious liberty, marriage laws, economic lawlessness and the rest—defined the moral limits of conformity to the requirements of the State, and the irreducible minimum of Christian liberties which must be upheld to the death. She has made it clear that to Caesar must be rendered the things which are Caesar's, and then marked out the still higher rights of God, to which Caesar himself must defer on pain of losing his own and to which Christians must conform their conduct as citizens even if they lose thereby their civic status or their lives. Nothing less than this has been at stake in the long series of moral judgements, delivered according to circumstances from the Chair of St. Peter or from the parish pulpit, which have been the Church's official contribution to politics through the centuries.

In our own day the same principles require the Church to intervene in politics with authoritative pronouncements on their moral aspects, addressed in the first instance to her own members but indirectly to the rulers of the secularized or paganized States in which most of them are living. Sometimes these pronouncements are made in general terms. Sometimes they have the nature of direct commands to the faithful to take this or that political action in

a particular case, as for example to defeat legislation contravening the natural moral law or violating the proper liberties of the supernatural Church. After all, when it is really one's duty to exercise a certain right—say, to secure a religious education for one's children—and it is open to one to take action to defend that right against violation, it is morally wrong not to take that action, and it is for the priest to say so, even though the effect be to alter the result of an election. This is a truth commonly overlooked by Catholic anti-clericals who make an outcry every time the Church, as the guardian of morals, issues a direct command in the sphere of politics.

(iii)

It is clear, therefore, that the anti-clerical who maintains that priests are going beyond their proper province when they make pronouncements in the sphere of politics is adopting a criterion of priestly conduct that is inextricably entangled with theological error. Nor will he have any reliable means of judging when he is in practice overstepping the boundary between the legitimate and the illegitimate forms of anti-clericalism. When he has secured the exclusion of priests, either by the State or by their ecclesiastical superiors, from political offices, legislatures, local governments, parties and political platforms, he will wish to lay down the law about the pulpit. He will want to restrain priests, not excluding the bishops, from making any pronouncement with a definite bearing on the political issues of the day. He will allege that he is concerned to prevent priests from acting as politicians; but he will, consciously or unconsciously, be banning them from acting as priests. For it is precisely in virtue of their priestly office that they have to make pronouncements on moral issues whether those have a political bearing or no.

Here, in fact, lies the real criterion, not necessarily of proper and improper conduct for a priest, but of the illegitimate and legitimate forms of anti-clericalism. There are two wholly different capacities in which priests may intervene in politics. They have ordinarily the right, and sometimes the duty, of intervening in political matters as citizens, using such civic status as the Constitution of their country grants them, precisely as a layman might. Or they may intervene as priests in virtue of their divine commission to feed the flock. And, corresponding to these two different capacities, two wholly different sets of considerations have to be weighed when there is a question of the priest exercising his right or duty in either of them.

Thus, whether priests should or should not intervene in politics as citizens is a question ordinarily to be decided by considerations of expediency in the light of the fact that their priestly office comes first in importance. Quite lawful political activity may be inexpedient for the priest if it would diminish the efficiency of his pastoral work or bring his priesthood into (even undeserved) discredit among his neighbours. Alternatively, it may be something like a civic duty for a priest to lend his name to a political movement or a public body in order to give them credit in his neighbours' eyes when no other means of doing so are available. On all such issues there is ample room for discussion of the pros and cons by those familiar with the political setting, even though it lies with ecclesiastical authority to make the actual decision as to what the individual priest should do.

By contrast with this, the question whether the priest should or should not intervene in political matters in his capacity as priest is primarily one of spiritual obligation, tempered by considerations of expediency in those comparatively rare cases in which what would ordinarily be a spiritual obligation ceases

to bind because its fulfilment would probably make a bad situation worse. And the nature of this spiritual obligation is defined in general terms by the constitution of the Church herself.

Speaking broadly, then, it would seem that anti-clericalism can claim at least the presumption of being legitimate (though not necessarily well-founded) when directed against the political activities of priests in their capacity as citizens ; and is almost certainly illegitimate when directed against their political activities in their capacity as priests, unless it be simply to protest against flagrant abuses of an admitted spiritual function.

(iv)

To make this distinction, however, is to be brought back to the fact that anti-clericals very rarely apply it consistently, if they apply it at all. Nor, indeed, are all priests careful to make the distinction obvious in their own political activities. If, therefore, some examples of legitimate anti-clericalism are set down together here, their separation from the illegitimate variety must be on a logical and not on a psychological basis. In actual practice the legitimate arguments are as often as not mixed with arguments that for Catholics are illegitimate, and are used as a cover for resistance to the political interventions of priests as priests.

We may note, then, first that a ban upon the exercise of their political rights by priests can be justified by no general political principles, least of all by those of Liberalism, though in practice Liberals are among the first to urge it. And ninety, if not ninety-nine per cent of English anti-clericals are at bottom Liberals, even though the great majority of them are in the habit of adopting "Conservative" or "Labour" as their political label. English anti-

clericals, therefore, are conspicuously in need of special arguments to justify their discrimination against priest-politicians.

Perhaps the favourite ground in this country is the assertion that priests, as spiritual persons, should not be concerned with mundane affairs. It is a favourite argument, partly because it echoes, even while it travesties, a real truth, partly because it makes a show of respect for the priesthood and so gives anti-clericalism an air of respectability in the eyes of the pious. But it reeks of that semi-Manichaean, wholly un-Catholic view which regards the spiritual and the non-spiritual as, not merely distinct, but essentially antagonistic and never to be brought into contact. Carried out logically, it would forbid a priest, because he holds a spiritual office, to seek the protection of the law for his property or to require the Borough Council to empty his dustbin. It could be more plausibly maintained if the Church imposed the Franciscan ideal of evangelical poverty upon her secular clergy, but she does not.

There have, of course, been periods (of which the present is one) in which the Church has herself discouraged, and in certain cases forbidden, the exercise by priests of many of the political rights which they possess as citizens, and has done so partly because much pre-occupation with the machinery of politics is a hindrance to the proper fulfilment of pastoral duties. From somewhat different motives Pius XI urged that Catholic Action, with its radically supernatural outlook, rather than party politics with their absorption in political technique, was the most suitable ground on which priests and laymen might collaborate in activities having a social and political bearing. A further motive in his mind for the prohibition of politics to priests, and for the embodiment of the prohibition in Concordats and the like, was to remove even unreasonable pretexts on the part

of the ultra-nationalistic and increasingly totalitarian States of his day for curtailing the spiritual and essential liberties of the priesthood.

There is not much support to be got out of all this for any sweeping exclusion of the priest from politics in order to safeguard his spiritual character, which it would seem in any case the province of his ecclesiastical superiors to watch over in the first instance. Certainly this reason for anti-clericalism has an air of disingenuousness when put forward by politicians. At the same time there is a sense in which it can be used by good Catholics with, as has been shown, some Papal authority behind it in existing circumstances.

Sometimes a personal dislike of priests, on account of their training or the character supposed to be formed by it, is the real source of the objection to their participation in politics. It is an antipathy that flourishes particularly in the soil of old-fashioned Protestantism or Continental laicism, but does not of itself convict a man of theological error, but more probably of a lack of charity and understanding. Or it may seek support in reasonable arguments, as when priests are accused (as sometimes lawyers are also) of an excessive professionalism of outlook due to a peculiarly rigorous and, in a sense, artificial intellectual training. This is at least an argument against priests and lawyers playing a part in politics disproportionate to their numbers. A still more reasonable argument to the same effect is that, when priests take a disproportionate part in politics, they unduly restrict the political openings for laymen, to whom the task of political leadership more naturally belongs.

There exists also a suspicion that the priest in politics makes use of his spiritual office to reinforce his influence as a citizen when no clear spiritual issue is at stake. Visions of priests dictating from the altar

to ignorant and superstitious congregations how to vote on purely political questions play a great part in inflaming Protestants against "priest rule"; and even instructed Catholics may reasonably fear that a quite proper respect for the priesthood may cause priests to have undue influence in matters on which they have no more authority to speak than laymen.

Indeed, it is not easy, with the best will in the world, for priests (or anyone else) to maintain in practice, or even in theory, in the day-to-day pressure and confusion of events, an exact separation between their professional and their private capacities in politics. The difficulty for priests is particularly great when the issue at stake directly concerns moral and religious liberties such as they have often to vindicate in their character as priests but for which they are entitled to work also as citizens in political parties or legislatures. (The participation of priests in the leadership of the German Centre Party during the *Kulturkampf* provides a case in point.) And, of course, every student of history can quote instances when even the intention of making the separation between his two capacities appears to have been lacking on the part of the priest.

Here, then, is another ground for a restricted anti-clericalism which certainly cannot be called unorthodox and, indeed, claims to be based on an exact appreciation of what the function of the priesthood in politics really is.

(v)

We are dealing, then, with a fundamentally different phenomenon in the unrestricted anti-clericalism that neither attempts to distinguish between the two capacities of the priest in politics nor admits its validity when it is pointed out, but condemns every intervention of the priest in the

political sphere on the mere ground that it touches on the political sphere.

Nevertheless, it is still necessary to distinguish between the theological error and the actual motives that inspire it ; for these cover a very wide range and may have nothing to do with theology. They may, for example, amount to little more than personal pique. No one likes to have his political opinions overruled, or even to see those of others overruled and to feel that his own turn may come next ; still less does he like his liberty of political action to be curtailed. It may safely be said that a good many Catholics drift into an unlawful anti-clericalism more or less unconsciously from no graver cause than this resentment. Moreover, all but the very youngest have been brought up politically in the Liberal tradition, which demanded complete liberty of political opinion and expression, untrammelled by the obligations of any transcendental morality.

In addition to these motives affecting men as individuals, there is the State's jealousy of any rival authority claiming any sort of allegiance from the citizens in the political field. This jealousy is exemplified in the old-fashioned hostility to the Holy See as "a foreign power" claiming authority in "this realm of England"—an hostility often met with among professed believers in the universality of the Catholic Church—and in the contemporary suspicion of "the black international" ranking with Jewry and international Communism as a seducer of citizens from their national or racial loyalty. At bottom it is a refusal to tolerate any centre of moral influence upon the citizens that is not subject to the State's own laws. It is therefore essentially erroneous but, by its appeal to national sentiments and to fear of foreigners, it has no difficulty of passing itself off among many Catholics as simply patriotic.

The morally absolutist totalitarian State of today

carries this ban on alien influences a stage further. It substitutes a positive for a merely negative attitude and enters the field of morals with a moral philosophy of its own, and demands for that philosophy a monopoly of the moral and mental formation of the citizens. When this claim is put forward, anti-clericalism inevitably merges into a general persecution of Catholicism itself, which only escapes the name of persecution because it is conducted by psychological instead of by physical weapons. But (as instances from Germany and elsewhere show) even this can be found tolerable by some Catholics, so well does the god-State know how to disguise itself as the organ of national regeneration.

There was never, in fact, greater need than there is today for Catholic anti-clericals to take their anti-clericalism seriously and clear their minds as to the precise grounds on which it may lawfully be based and the precise limits up to which they may regard it as a permissible indulgence.

F. R. HOARE.

ANGELS IN THE LITURGY

THE dogmatic treatise on the Angels affords to theologians ample scope for free discussion ; since the Church has always been chary of committing herself to formal definitions on points which divine Revelation has left, as it were, veiled from our knowledge. Certainly, both the Old and the New Testaments abound in references to the angelic ministry ; of these the Church has amply availed herself ; beyond them she has never shown any intention of proceeding. The reason for this may be the undue cult given by pagans and many groups of early heretics to the spirit-world—*Genii, Eones, Heroes, Daimones, Demiurgi, Dii minores, Dii tutelares, Lares*, astral spirits, *et hoc genus omne*. St. Paul had cause to warn the early Christians not to be seduced by the false “worship of angels,”¹ although he himself, like all the other writers of the New Testament, takes the angelic spirits for granted and assigns to them quite a conspicuous place in the economy of salvation. The Fathers² are equally explicit and positive when making use of all that Revelation has taught us regarding the angelic world, and they seem all equally unwilling to add to it. It was only in the sixth century that the *Heavenly Hierarchy* of the Pseudo-Dionysius, which unfortunately in subsequent centuries was accepted as a work of the Apostolic age, began to influence and colour the teaching of the Catholic doctors on the

¹ Col. II, 18. The Greek has *θρησκεία τῶν ἀγγέλων*—worship rather than religion.

² The Patristic literature on Angelology is very abundant. De Journal's *Enchiridion Patristicum* (Index theol., p. 767, ed. X et XI, 1937) gives no less than 122 patristic excerpts dealing with the Angels. The following Fathers are worth perusing in this connection : Justin, *Apol.* I, c. VI—P.G., T. VI, col. 336 ; Athenagoras, *Legatio*, c. X—P.G., T. VI, col. 909 ; Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, I, II, c. 32, 5—P.L., T. VIII, col. 830 ; Cyprian, *Ep.* 72, 2—P.L., T. III, col. 1086 ; Origen, *Cont. Celis.*, L.V, c. V—P.G., T. XI, col. 1185 ; Eusebius, *Praep. Evan.*, L. VII, c. 15—P.G., T. XXII, col. 553 ; Ambrose, *De Viduit.*, IX, 15—P.L., T. 16, col. 251.

Angels.¹ It was then that a large number of new theories were launched regarding the Angels, such as their hierarchical divisions, their specific nature, their knowledge, the difference between the *Angeli assistentes* and *Angeli ministrantes*, the way in which they influence the material world in general and man in particular, and other similar points.

As we should expect, in the Liturgy we find a most illuminating presentment of what our belief in the Angels ought to be. Its key-principle is St. Paul's text, in which he calls the Angels "ministering spirits sent unto the service of those who are destined to inherit salvation".² Thus the Liturgy considers the angelic world mainly in relation to man, as ministering to man ; only in a few instances are the heavenly spirits described in their own proper setting as surrounding God, attending on Him, and praising Him ; and even then this presentment is intended as a spur to the devotion of the faithful. There are three sets of circumstances in which the Liturgy turns instinctively to the Angels as our associates in the service of God or as "ministering to us unto salvation". (i) The Angels assist at, and take part with us in, the performance of the divine worship ; it is they who take up our prayers to God ; (ii) they are deputed by God to help and guide us on our way to Him, to defend us and ward off all dangers from us ; and (iii) they assist us in our last agony, and after our death bear the soul to the judgement seat of God.

First, as to the participation of the Angels in our liturgical functions. This has ever been part and parcel of our Catholic tradition, handed down indeed to the Church by the Synagogue. St. Paul

¹ St. Thomas deals very exhaustively with Angelology in the *Summa*, I, QQ. 50-64 and 106-114. In the latter section he speaks of the ministry of the Angels.

² Heb. I, 14.

orders women to veil their heads in the Church on account of the angelic presence. In fact, many Fathers add, the Angels love to be associated with us in the Liturgy. St. Benedict refers to this when treating of the spirit which should animate his monks in choir :¹ "Let us always be mindful of what the Prophet says : ' . . . In the sight of the Angels I will hymn to Thee'. Therefore let us consider in what manner it behoveth us to be in the sight of God and of the Angels, and so let us sing in choir, that mind and voice may sing with one accord." Perhaps one of the most charming illustrations of Catholic belief on this point is Alcuin's reference to St. Bede's saying :² "I know that the Angels assist at the canonical hours with the Community ; what then, if they were not to find me with the monks ? Would they not say : Where is Bede ? Why does he not come to the appointed worship with the Brethren ?"

Convinced of this angelic assistance at Christian worship, the Liturgy readily associates our prayers with those of the angelic choirs. On almost every Christian festival it loves to recall the historical part played by the Angels therein. Thus at Christmas the Angels are introduced with the words

*Gaudet chorus coelestium
Et Angeli canunt Deo . . .*

and again in the antiphons and responses answering the question

Quem vidistis, pastores ?

the shepherds reply :

*Natum vidimus et choros Angelorum collaudantium
Dominum ! . . .*

¹ Regula, c. 19.

² See Plummer, *Ven. Bedæ Opera Hist.*, Vol. I, Intro. pp. xii-xlii. Oxford, 1896.

Vol. xix.

On Palm Sunday the Liturgy sings :

Caetus in excelsis Te laudat coelicus omnis . . .
Cum Angelis et pueris fideles inveniamur Triumphatori mortis
clamantes :
Hosanna !

The great Easter Solemnities are heralded by the Deacon with the triumphant invitation :

Exultet jam Angelica turba coelorum ! . . .

All the antiphons record the angelic apparitions at the empty tomb, as also do one of the hymns and the Sequence :

Quia surrexit Dominus
Resplendens clamat Angelus.
Dic nobis, Maria—quid vidisti in via ? . . .
Angelicos testes—sudarium et vestes.

On Ascension Thursday, the Liturgy pictures to us the admiration of the Angels at the triumph of Christ's sacred Humanity :

Tremunt videntes Angeli
Versam vicem mortalium ! . . .

and in the lessons of the second Nocturn St. Leo's words are read, as a commentary :

. . . humani generis natura conscenderet, supergressura angelicos ordines et ultra Archangelorum altitudines elevanda.

On our Lady's Assumption, the Angels are the first to rejoice :

Assumpta est Maria in coelum, gaudent Angeli :
laudantes benedicunt Dominum.

On the feast of All Saints, we glorify the Angels as well : they are mentioned throughout in antiphons, verses, responses and hymns :

*Et vos, beata agmina
Coelestium spirituum . . .*¹

When commemorating the Dedication of a church, the Liturgy sees the heavenly Jerusalem

*Angelis coronata
Ut sponsata comite*²

Then, there are the joyful strains of the *Te Deum* :

Tibi omnes Angeli, Tibi coeli et universae Potestates . . .

The Liturgy is particularly explicit as regards her profound conviction that the Angels assist at the culminating moment of all our functions : She prefaces the great *Actio* of the Mass by associating herself with the angelic choirs in their eternal hymn to the Holy Trinity. The Consecration itself is followed by that mysterious prayer :

*Jube haec perferri per manus sancti Angeli tui, in sublime altare
tuum . . .*³

¹ *Brev. Monast.*—which is the original. The modern version has : *Et vos beata per novem—distincta gyros agmina. . .*

² Again according to the original text in the *Brev. Monast.* The modern wording is : *Sponsaeque ritu cingeris—Mille angelorum millibus.*

³ Theologians and Liturgiologists differ in their interpretation of this passage : the Angel referred to therein is (i) the Angel of the Altar, (ii) the Angel of the Sacrifice, (iii) the Angel of the Church, (iv) St. Michael who in the early Middle Ages was simply called the *Angel—Angelus*, (v) Christ—the Angel of the Great Counsel, (vi) the Holy Ghost. See Dom. Cagin, O.S.B., *L'Anaphore Apostolique*, Paris, 1919, pp. 241, sqq. ; Dom Cabrol, O.S.B., *Epiclèse*, in *Dict. d'Archeol. et de Lit.*, col. 165, note 4 ; de la Taille, S.J., *Mysterium Fidei*, 2nd. ed., Paris, 1924, pp. 446, sqq. ; Dom Schuster, O.S.B., *Liber Sacramentorum*, Torino, 1927, vol. VIII, p. 284. We incline to Cardinal Schuster's explanation : the Angel of the Canon is simply St. Michael.

When at the Offertory of the Mass the blessing is asked upon the burned incense, St. Michael is named as the mediator, and "he gives an additional aroma of sweetness to the burning perfumes".¹

(ii) The Angels are deputed by God to watch over us, to guide us, to help us and to protect us against all dangers.

In a prayer, often used by the Church, each of these forms of angelic ministry is stressed :

*Exaudi nos, Domine sancte, Pater omnipotens, aeternae Deus :
et mittere digneris sanctum Angelum tuum de coelis, qui custodiat,
foveat, protegat, visitet atque defendat omnes habitantes in hoc
habituaculo.*

This prayer, we repeat, occurs frequently in the Liturgy.² It is used on all Sundays to exorcise the place and purify the people before the celebration of the parochial Mass ; to bless new houses, new bridges, new schools, new printing presses and telegraph offices ; when the priest visits the sick or brings them Holy Communion, and on sundry other occasions.

Indeed, the protection of the Holy Angels is continually invoked in the blessings of the Roman Ritual or the Roman Pontifical. In the following examples we would call attention to the expressive boldness and beauty of the Latin phrases. At the ceremony of the Dedication of a new Church, the following petition is inserted in the Litany of the Saints :

*Ut in eo Angelorum custodiam deputare digneris,
Te rogamus, audi nos—*

¹ Dom Vonier, O.S.B., *The Angels*, ch. I, p. 12, London, 1927.

² See the respective Blessings in the Roman Ritual. The edition here quoted is that of Pustet, Ratisbon and Rome, 1913.

and in the final blessing over the mixture of wine, salt, ashes and water wherewith the altar is washed before being consecrated, the Pontiff prays

. . . Angelum lucis amicum, bonorum provisorem defensoremque constituas. . . . Et mereamur habere nobiscum Angelum pacis, castitatis, caritatis ac veritatis qui semper ab omnibus malis nos custodiat, protegat et defendat.

On blessing a new house or a new school the priest asks God

. . . intra parietes domus istius Angeli tuae lucis inhabitent, eamque et ejus habitatores custodiant.

The blessing used over a new railway or other conveyance, besides being a graphic description of what the faithful expect from God, is a classic example of the unsurpassed daring of our intercessory liturgy :

Benedic currus istos dextera tua sancta : adjunge ad ipsos sanctos Angelos tuos, ut omnes, qui in eis vehentur, liberent et custodiant semper a periculis universis . . .

For a new oven (*pistrinum*) the Ritual prays God :

. . . Angelumque lucis ac defensionis ei assignare digneris . . .

at the blessing of a new bell :

. . . ita, dum hujus vasculi sonitus transit per nubila, Ecclesiae tuae conventum manus conservet angelica . . .

and over the oil :

Domine Deus omnipotens, cui astat exercitus Angelorum cum tremore, quorum servitium spirituale cognoscitur . . .

There is another group of blessings in which God is asked to send His Angels to attend to the needs

of particular persons—pilgrims, women with child, children. All these prayers too are exceedingly apt. We quote only that for pilgrims :

. . . Angelo tuo comite, ad eum quo pergunt locum ac domum ad aeternae salutis portum feliciter valeant pervenire.

There are also the prayers entreating God to send down His Angels to ward off special dangers. Thus every evening, before retiring, we pray at Compline :

Visita, quaesumus Domine, habitationem istam et omnes insidias inimici ab ea longe repelle : Angeli tui sancti habitent in ea, qui nos in pace custodiant . . .

—similarly throughout the particularly trying season of Lent we repeat every day at Vespers and Lauds the verse

Angelis suis Deus mandavit de te, ut custodiant te in omnibus viis tuis : in manibus portabunt te ne unquam offendas ad lapidem pedem tuum.

Lastly, there is the consoling doctrine of the Guardian Angels so aptly summed up by St. Robert Bellarmine in the two proper hymns recited on their feast (2 Oct.) :

*Custodes hominum psallimus Angelos
Naturae fragili quos Pater addidit
Coelestis comites, insidiantibus
Ne succumberet hostibus.*

The same doctrine is also most happily expressed in one of the prayers of the Baptism of adults :

(Rogamus) te quaesumus Domine : ut mittere digneris sanctum Angelum tuum de coelis, qui similiter custodiat et hunc famulum tuum N. et perducat eum ad gratiam Baptismi tui.

See finally the beautiful reference to the Guardian Angels in the prayer *Summe Sacerdos*, recited by the priest before Mass :

Muni me beatorum Angelorum pia et fida custodia ac tutela fortissima, ut hostes omnium bonorum confusi discedant.

(iii) The ministry of the Angels is especially invoked and most confidently expected by the Church on behalf of the dying Christian and of the soul after the death of the body. In the immortal lines of his *Dream of Gerontius* the genius of Cardinal Newman has most happily caught the spirit of the Liturgy on this subject.

Most of the prayers of the Ritual for administering the Sacrament of Extreme Unction, the Recommendation of a departing soul and the Burial Service, strike the same note. As soon as the priest enters the room of the sick person, he prays :

... *effugiat ex hoc loco accessus daemonum : adsint Angeli pacis*
... *det—habitantibus in hoc habitaculo—Angelum bonum custodem.*

When recommending to God the soul of the dying person the priest says :

Egredienti itaque animae tuae de corpore splendidus Angelorum coetus occurrat. . . . Cedat tibi teterrimus satanas cum satellitibus suis : in adventu tuo te comitantibus Angelis contremiscat, atque in aeternae noctis chaos immane diffugiat . . .

and again :

Aperiantur ei coeli, collaetentur illi Angeli. Suscipiat eum sanctus Michael, Archangelus Dei, qui militiae coelestis meruit principatum. Veniant illi obviam sancti Angeli Dei, et perducant eum in civitatem coelestem Jerusalem.

When the soul has parted from the body the priest continues praying :

Subvenite, sancti Dei, occurrite, Angeli Domini, suscipientes animam ejus, offerentes eam in conspectu Altissimi. Suscipiat te Christus qui vocavit te, et in sinum Abrahae Angeli deducant te.

At the Offertory of the Mass offered up for the soul of the deceased, the Liturgy entreats God

. . . Signifer sanctus Michael repraesentet eam in lucem sanctam . . .

and while the body is being carried to the tomb, the Liturgy still follows the soul in her flight to God and sings :

In paradisum deducant te Angeli. . . . Chorus Angelorum te suscipiat . . .

Even here, at the grave, the Liturgy seems loth to leave unprotected the body of the faithful Christian, as witness the following amazing prayer :

*Hunc tumulum benedicere dignare, eique Angelum tuum sanctum deputa custodem . . .*¹

As a final example we cannot omit a reference to the burial of Christian infants. Here we find one of those happy thoughts which are so very characteristic of the Liturgy. The prayer used for these little ones is simply the Collect assigned to the feasts of the Angels:

Deus quæ miro ordine Angelorum ministeria hominumque dispensas . . .

¹ Is there here a remnant of the pagan—chiefly Egyptian—practices of the *cultus sepulchrae* with its *custos sepulchri*? If so, here we have another instance of ancient heathen rites hallowed by the Church's Liturgy and made by it thoroughly Christian.

Thus in the eyes of their Mother the Church the little ones who die in God's grace are Angels *tout court*.

.

We have purposely refrained in this article from referring to the feasts of individual Angels—Michael, Gabriel, Raphael—who now receive a special veneration in the course of the Liturgical Year. Those of St. Michael (8 May and 29 Sept.) date from the sixth century at the latest. Those of St. Gabriel (24 March) and of St. Raphael (24 October) were extended to the universal Church quite recently, under Benedict XV, and even at the present time in some places—or at any rate among us Benedictines—they are not kept. It is remarkable that the older feasts of St. Michael still continue to have an “anonymous Collect”. The name of the Archangel is not mentioned therein. Instead, we find the time-honoured prayer for all Angels

Deus qui miro ordine.

Perhaps we might hazard the suggestion that the insistence of the Angelic Doctor on the hierarchical order of the universe and the close connection between the spirit-world as influencing and directing the material creation, including man, is derived not only from the works of the Pseudo-Dionysius, but ultimately from the liturgical presentation of the ministry of the Angels to mankind. Be that as it may, the Liturgy certainly bears witness to St. Paul's dictum: “All are ministering spirits sent unto the service of those destined to inherit salvation.”

ROMANUS RIOS, O.S.B.

PRIESTS AND MATRIMONIAL DISPENSATIONS

FORMERLY the law granted no power to priests to dispense in matrimonial impediments, although they sometimes obtained delegated faculties. In the reigns of Leo XIII and Pius X certain powers were granted to them to dispense in the hour of death. These are contained, and even amplified, in Canons 1043 and 1044. The Code also gives powers in other urgent cases, outside the hour of death. These are contained in Canon 1045. The object of the present article is to give an explanation of the above canons. Although the title refers only to priests, it is clearly necessary, in order to explain what their powers are, to speak also of the powers granted to local Ordinaries by the same canons.

Among the priests mentioned in the canons are those non-delegated priests who assist at marriages in accordance with the prescriptions of Canon 1098. By this canon, when neither the Ordinary nor the parochus, nor a priest delegated by either, can be approached or summoned to assist at the marriage without serious inconvenience, the parties may validly and lawfully marry in the presence merely of two witnesses (1) in the danger of death, and (2) even at other times when it is prudently foreseen that the inconvenience will last for a month. In both cases, however, if the presence of another non-delegated priest can be procured, his assistance at the marriage is necessary for its lawfulness, though not for its validity. In order to avoid repetition throughout this article the above non-delegated priest will be denoted by the term "assistant priest".

For the sake of clearness it may be well to begin by summarizing the powers granted to Ordinaries and priests, noting certain differences and certain similarities in various cases considered by the canons.

I

Powers granted to Ordinaries

A. *Differences*

- | In danger of death | In urgent cases |
|--|---|
| (1) Can dispense even if there is time to approach the Holy See. | (1) Cannot dispense if there is time to approach the Holy See. |
| (2) Can dispense in formalities. | (2) Most probably cannot dispense in formalities. |
| (3) Can dispense (a) for peace of conscience or (b) to legitimize offspring. | (3) Can dispense if there is a grave difficulty in deferring marriage when (a) all preparations have been made, or (b) when it has been invalidly contracted. |
| (4) Can dispense <i>peregrini</i> . | (4) More probably, can dispense only his own subjects. |

B. *Similarities*

- (1) The impediments (in the strict sense) in which he can dispense are the same in both cases.
- (2) In both cases scandal must be removed.
- (3) For marriages with non-Catholics the promises must be given in both cases.

II

Powers granted to parochus, assistant priest and (probably) delegated priest

- (1) These have no power to dispense unless it is impossible to have recourse to the Ordinary, or unless they are prevented from so doing by the necessity of preserving a secret.
- (2) Under these conditions they have the same powers as the Ordinary, with one restriction, that, outside the danger of death, they can dispense only in occult cases.

III

Powers granted to Confessors

Confessors have the same powers as the above, with the further restriction that, even in the hour of death, they can dispense only *pro foro interno*, and in confession.

We will now consider the three canons in detail.

Canon 1043

In danger of death, Local Ordinaries may for the peace of conscience, and, if necessary, for the legitimation of the offspring, dispense with their own subjects wherever they are, and with all who are actually staying in their own territory, in the formalities, and in all ecclesiastical impediments, whether they are public or occult, even though there are several, with the exception of those arising from the priesthood, and of affinity in the direct line when the marriage has been consummated. Scandal must be removed, and the promises given when there is an impediment of mixed religion or disparity of cult.

This canon mentions the powers which are given to the Local Ordinaries, e.g. the Diocesan Bishops, the Vicars General, and Vicars Capitular (cf. Canon 198). The condition "if there be no time to approach the Holy See" is not added as it is in Canon 1045, so that the Ordinary can dispense even if he has time to apply.

When can he dispense?

He can dispense when the person is in danger of death. He can do so, not only when the danger arises from sickness, but when it arises from any other cause, e.g. when a person who is not in danger of death through sickness is about to undergo a dangerous operation. It is not necessary, even in the case of absolute impediments,¹ that the person directly affected by the impediment should be in danger; the dispensation may be granted even when the danger affects the other party only.

¹ Absolute impediments are those which prevent a person from marrying anyone, e.g. the impediments of vow or age; relative impediments are those which prevent marriage between certain determinate persons only, e.g. the impediments of consanguinity or affinity.

For what reasons may he dispense ?

(1) For the peace of conscience, e.g. "if by marriage scandal is removed, a sin or a proximate occasion of sin is removed, material harm is repaired, hatred is extinguished", etc.¹ Danger of sin, therefore, does not refer merely to a sin against chastity. It may refer to any other species of sin, e.g. of hatred.²

(2) For the legitimation of the offspring. The common opinion is that this reason does not hold for the children of an adulterous or sacrilegious union, for these are not legitimized either by the dispensation (Canon 1051) or by the subsequent marriage (Canon 1116). A few hold the opposite, as it is more easy to obtain an indult of legitimation if the marriage has already taken place.³

According to all authors, either reason alone is sufficient, even though the code says "et".

What is the object of his powers ?

He can dispense in the formalities, and in all ecclesiastical impediments whether diriment or prohibitory, public or occult, except two, i.e. those arising (1) from the priesthood and (2) from affinity in the direct line (in any degree), if the marriage from which the affinity arises has been consummated.

Hence :

(1) He can dispense from affinity *in linea directa* if the marriage has not been consummated.

(2) He cannot dispense in impediments over which the church has no power, i.e. in impediments of the natural or divine law.

(3) He can dispense even in the diaconate and in vows, even solemn vows of chastity. For although a vow does not constitute an ecclesiastical, but a divine,

¹ Gasparri, n. 394.

² Cf. Piscetta, VI, n. 352.

³ Capello, n. 232.

impediment, the restriction to ecclesiastical impediments is clearly meant to forbid the use of power which the church does not possess. This is evident from the fact that in the decree of 20 Feb., 1888, which has now been inserted in an amplified form in this canon, instructions were given for removing scandal when a dispensation was granted "*cum iis qui sacro diaconatus vel subdiaconatus ordine sunt insigniti vel solemnem professionem religiosam emisierint*". And the former, according to the most common opinion, and certainly the latter, have taken a solemn vow of chastity.

(4) He can dispense even if there are two or more impediments of the same or different species.

(5) He can dispense in the formalities. He can therefore dispense from the presence of a priest, and even, if necessary, from the presence of one or both witnesses. The latter power, however, should not be used without real necessity, for in addition to the fact that a just cause is always required for any dispensation, in this case it is of grave moment that there should be witnesses, if possible, to testify that the marriage has really taken place.

(6) He has not the power to grant a *sanatio*.

Whom can he dispense ?

He can dispense :

(1) His own subjects, even though they are not actually staying in his diocese.

(2) *Peregrini* and *vagi* who are actually staying in his diocese.

What conditions must be fulfilled ?

(1) Scandal must be removed. Circumstances will decide what course of action must be taken in order to secure the fulfilment of this condition. Thus if the impediment is public, the concession of the dispensation should, if necessary, be made public. Often, however, express public notification will not be

necessary, as it will usually be publicly taken for granted that, when the priest assists, all necessary preliminaries have been complied with.

(2) If a dispensation is granted in mixed religion, or in disparity of cult, the promises must be given. Hence the dispensation must be refused even if it is only the non-Catholic who refuses to give them.¹ If, however, the promises can be obtained *viva voce*, the dispensation may be granted. For the law only requires that they should *regulariter* be in writing (Canon 1061). If, however, the non-Catholic refuses to promise even *viva voce*, and it is the Catholic who is in danger of death, it is not easy to decide what the confessor's mode of action should be. For even though the marriage cannot be validated, he should, if possible, dispose the person for absolution. Under these circumstances we suggest that he may act as follows.

If the person thinks that he is certain to die, the confessor should act as he would act if the impediment were one in which a dispensation is absolutely impossible, i.e. he should rouse the penitent to sorrow and to the resolution to avoid further sin, to remove scandal, as far as possible, and then absolve absolutely if the person is certainly disposed, and conditionally if he is only probably disposed.

If the person feels that, although there is the danger of death, there is also a hope of recovery, we think that the confessor should, in addition to the above, obtain from the penitent the declaration that in case of recovery, the latter will insist on the promises and the validation of the marriage. It is true that one should not destroy true sorrow by proposing to the penitent hypothetical cases which he has not in mind. But this will not, it seems, be as a rule a hypothetical case. From the nature of the case the

¹ Holy Office, 14 Jan., 1932.

penitent will be thinking of it, and it is necessary, therefore, to face the difficulty. Considering, however, that there is danger of death, and that the contingency contemplated is not certain, the confessor should usually have little difficulty in persuading the penitent to form the above resolution.

To avoid subsequent difficulties about the seal, it would seem advisable, as a rule, that the priest should first secure these dispositions outside confession. For he has also to give Viaticum and Extreme Unction if there is no extra-sacramental obstacle.

Canon 1044

In the same circumstances, the parish priest and assistant priest have exactly the same powers as those granted to the Ordinary by the preceding canon, if the Ordinary cannot be approached. If, however, it is possible to approach the Ordinary, they have no power to dispense.

It is impossible, if there is a danger that the person may die or become unconscious before an answer can be obtained. There is no obligation of using the telephone or telegraph for this purpose.¹ If recourse is possible only in this way, the parish priest, etc. may dispense. They have the power, if it is physically possible to approach the Ordinary, but if this could only be done with serious inconvenience.² For then it is morally impossible to approach him. For this reason, they seem to have the power, if approaching the Ordinary would bring the danger of the violation of a secret.³ Furthermore, Canon 1045 expressly states this when it is a question of dispensing in urgent cases outside the hour of death, from which we

¹ Comm. Can. Law, 12 Nov., 1922.

² Gasparri, n. 397.

³ De Smet, 792.

PRIESTS AND MATRIMONIAL DISPENSATIONS 313

may conclude *a fortiori* that it applies at the hour of death.

The parish priest and assistant priest have the above power even for public impediments and the parish priest can even dispense, if necessary, with the formalities.

The confessor has the same power in danger of death if he cannot approach the Ordinary, but only *pro foro interno*, and in the act of hearing confession.

Canon 1045

Local Ordinaries can dispense in the same impediments as those mentioned in Canon 1043, observing the same conditions regarding the removal of scandal and the giving of the promises in marriages with non-Catholics, when any of the impediments are discovered after all preparations have been made for the marriage, which without danger of grave harm cannot be deferred until a dispensation is obtained from the Holy See.

This faculty holds also for the validation of a marriage already contracted, if there is the same danger in delay, and no time to approach the Holy See.

Parish priests, assistant priests, and confessors have the same power, but only for occult cases when approach to the Ordinary is impossible, or brings the danger of the violation of a secret.

Hence *before marriage* the Ordinary can dispense in the same impediments, whether one or several, as at the hour of death, provided that :

(1) The impediment is discovered when all preparations have been made for the marriage ; and

(2) It cannot without danger of grave harm be deferred until the Holy See can be approached.

It is not necessary that the impediment should

have been entirely unknown previously, and now discovered for the first time ; it is sufficient if after all preparations have been made it is now for the first time brought to the knowledge of the Ordinary or parish priest.¹ The power of dispensing seems to be present even if the parties in bad faith concealed the impediment lest the marriage should be prevented,² or "with the object of more easily obtaining a dispensation. For the object of the law is not merely the good of the contracting parties, but the avoidance of grave public harm".³

Some⁴ consider that by this canon the Bishop can dispense whenever there is a grave and urgent necessity for marriage, even though no preparations have been made for its celebration. They hold, therefore, that the clause "*cum jam omnia sunt parata ad nuptias*" is not to be understood exclusively, i.e. as the only case in which the Ordinary can dispense, but as indicating one case in which there is frequently a grave and urgent reason for the dispensation.

It is not unlikely that this view will be accepted in the future by the Commission of Canon Law, but if so, it would seem to be an extensive interpretation (cf. Canon 17). Meanwhile one may doubt about its truth. There are several difficult cases which may arise when marriage is desired and there is an impediment and no time to approach the Holy See. The Holy See has picked out one in which there are very special difficulties about deferring the marriage, and allowed the Ordinary and sometimes the parish priest to dispense. It does not follow that because it legislated for one specific difficulty that it wished the law to apply to every difficulty in general. In fact in this very canon it allows the Ordinary to dispense in public cases, but even when the difficulties are the

¹ Comm. Can. Law, 1 March, 1921.

² Wouters, n. 805.

³ Piscetta, n. 355.

⁴ E.g. Capello, n. 233, 3rd ed.

same it does not allow the parish priest to dispense when the Ordinary cannot be approached. Furthermore, this canon was meant to provide for the *casus perplexus*, which arose, not whenever there was a grave reason for a dispensation, but when there was a special difficulty in deferring a marriage for which preparations had already been made. If, however, such an urgent difficulty should arise, we think that the Ordinary could use the power granted to him by Canon 81. This canon, however, would not help the parish priest. But for the latter the question does not seem to be practical, for if no preparations have been made for the marriage there will necessarily be some delay, both from the nature of the case, and from the exigences of the civil law. During the delay he will have time to consult the Ordinary, in which case he certainly has no power.

Regarding the second condition required before the Ordinary can dispense, i.e. danger of harm if there is delay, (a) the harm feared must be grave, (b) the danger need not be certain, it is sufficient if it is probable, and (c) unlike the case of the danger of death, the Ordinary has no power if there is time to approach the Holy See.

The harm feared may be temporal or spiritual, e.g. scandal, loss of character, pecuniary loss, grave quarrels and dissensions.¹

After the marriage the same rule holds, i.e. the Ordinary can dispense for the sake of its validation if, without the danger of grave harm, this cannot be deferred until the Holy See can be approached. The harm feared will be "especially the danger of incontinence, i.e. when the parties either cannot, or will not separate, and they cannot live together without danger of sin, or, when the impediment is publicly known, without danger of scandal".²

¹ Gasparri, n. 399.

² Ibid.

Extent of his powers.

He has the same powers as at the hour of death, except, it would seem, that of dispensing in the formalities.

A few (e.g. Vermeersch 758 ; De Smet n. 764 note) hold that he can dispense from the formalities, so that the extent of his powers is the same as at the hour of death. For clandestinity was formerly called an impediment, and may still be called an impediment in the broad sense (and in the index to the code it is even placed under *impedimentia dirimentia*). Most authors hold the opposite. For (1) clandestinity is not now in legal language called an impediment, and especially (2) the power is expressly mentioned in Canon 1043, and its omission from Canon 1045 is clearly deliberate and with the intention of excluding it. Hence the opinion which gives him this power does not seem to be even probable.

Can he dispense peregrini ?

Few authors discuss this. The code does not expressly allow him to dispense them, so that it would seem that he has not the power to do so, especially as in Canon 1043 *peregrini* are expressly mentioned. For dispensation is an act of jurisdiction which can only be exercised over subjects.¹ *Peregrini* are not *per se* subjects (Canon 94) unless the law in special cases (e.g. Canons 1043, 1245) makes them subjects.² However, Capello³ and Vermeersch⁴ think that he can dispense. There is certainly no express legal foundation for this view, so that it is at least advisable to avoid making use of it. In practice, therefore, it is better that the priest should apply, not to his own Ordinary, but to the Ordinary of the parties, as the latter can certainly dispense.

¹ De Smet, n. 774.

² N. 252, note.

³ Cf. Gasparri, n. 414.

⁴ I. 302.

Powers of the parish priest, assistant priest and confessor.

They have no power to dispense unless the Ordinary cannot be approached, or can only be approached at the risk of the violation of a secret. Otherwise they have the same power as the Ordinary, but (unlike the danger of death) only for occult cases.

The confessor, however, can only dispense *pro foro interno* and in confession. But he has this power, even if the confession is null, or if absolution is not given, provided the confession is sacramental.¹

The code does not say sacramental secret; therefore the term applies not only to matter which comes under the seal, but to any other secret which could not well be communicated to the Ordinary.

The code does not say "occult impediments" but "occult cases". Their power is not limited, therefore, to dispensing in the former, i.e. in impediments which cannot be proved *in foro externo* (Canon 1037), but applies to all impediments which are *de facto* occult, even though they are *natura sua* public (Commission of Canon Law, 28 Dec., 1927) e.g. occult affinity.²

W. DUNNE.

¹ Cf. Capello, n. 238.

² In the terminology generally employed before the code, impediments are public *de facto* when they are publicly known, and occult *de facto* when they are not publicly known. They are *natura sua* public when normally they would be publicly known (e.g. spiritual relationship), and *natura sua* occult when normally they would not be publicly known (e.g. unlawful consanguinity, or crime). Hence an impediment may be *natura sua* public, but *de facto* occult, or *natura sua* occult but *de facto* public. The code, however, has given a different interpretation to these words. Impediments are public when they can be proved in *foro externo*, otherwise they are occult. But the old terminology is retained in judicial matters by the code (Canon 1971), and by the S. Poenitentiary, and by authors in certain cases for practical utility. But when the words "public" and "occult" are used without any qualification they should be understood in the sense given to them in Canon 1037 (Gasparri, nn. 209, 210).

A POINT OF LUCAN STYLE

IN an able and interesting article in these pages Mgr. Knox expressed the opinion that practically any Catholic, if asked whether our Lady stayed with St. Elizabeth until the birth of St. John the Baptist, would reply, "Of course she did."¹ This is true, and without a doubt the answer would correspond with the historical fact. One may go further and say without fear of error that our Lady remained until after the circumcision and naming of the child on the eighth day. Chronologically, therefore, the mention of our Lady's departure should come after the Benedictus, that is after Luke i, 79. Actually St. Luke has placed it in verse 56 before the mention of the birth of St. John. The trouble is that to our modern conceptions of historical writing this implies that the event placed first in the narrative happened before that narrated after it. In other words St. Luke appears to a modern western reader to indicate that our Lady left St. Elizabeth before the birth of the Precursor. But St. Luke was not writing according to modern canons and had no intention of conveying such an impression. What is the explanation?

The explanation lies in the manner adopted by St. Luke of dividing his matter up to the public ministry of St. John the Baptist into units or "scenes". These are seven in number. The first relates the annunciation and conception of St. John the Baptist and the second the annunciation by the Archangel Gabriel to our Lady. The third narrates her visit to St. Elizabeth. The fourth recounts the birth and circumcision of the Baptist as the fifth does in the case of our Lord. In the sixth and seventh respectively we have an account of the Presentation in the Temple and of the loss and finding of the Child Jesus. The second point, and an important one for the chronology,

¹ Feb. 1940, p. 99.

is that these scenes are self-contained. Six out of the seven end with what might be compared to a scenic "exit". Thus in the last sentence of the first "scene" "Elizabeth . . . hid herself five months," i, 24. At the end of the second "the angel departed from her", i, 38. At the conclusion of the third "Mary . . . returned to her own house", i, 56. The fourth ends with the statement that St. John "was in the deserts until the day of his manifestation to Israel", i, 80. The fifth does not allow of any such "exit" of the main actors, as it ends with the circumcision of our Lord and is followed by the Presentation, and the same persons were principals in both. In this scene also, however, St. Luke is true to his method in that he has two dismissals, if that word may be used, of the subsidiary actors. Thus we read "the angels departed from them into heaven", ii, 15, and "the shepherds returned", ii, 20. These phrases end two episodes in the main scene. At the conclusion of the sixth scene, that of the Presentation, we are told that "they returned into Galilee to their city Nazareth", ii, 39. Lastly, after the story of the finding in the Temple St. Luke says, "He went down with them and came to Nazareth", ii, 51.

I have said above that each of these scenes is self-contained. In each St. Luke says what he has to say of the persons concerned in order to round off his scene, even if in so doing he breaks the chronological sequence by mentioning a fact that historically occurred after events he has yet to mention. Thus at the end of the fourth scene that deals with the birth and circumcision of St. John, he adds that he "was in the deserts until the day of his manifestation to Israel", i, 80. Now the term of the period here indicated, the beginning of St. John's public preaching, did not arrive until some three decades after the Nativity of our Lord which St. Luke has not yet narrated. And though we are nowhere told at what

age St. John retired to the deserts, it cannot have been for a good many years after the Nativity of Christ, as this event was separated by only six months from the birth of the Precursor. But St. Luke mentions St. John's retiring to the deserts at this point as it makes a suitable ending to the scene and gives what was probably the only possible "exit" at the end of it.

Just as the conclusion of the fourth scene, as has been shown, disregards other events that were to precede it in time, so also the conclusion of the third scene. Although our Lady was present at the time of the circumcision and naming of the Baptist, she took no part in those happenings that called for mention in St. Luke's narrative. And, therefore, as in St. Luke's scheme our Lady was not an actor in this fourth scene, her "exit" was naturally placed by him at the end of the third. Hence we read in i, 56 that "Mary . . . returned to her own house". To translate the following verse with pluperfects, "Now Elizabeth's full time of being delivered had come and she had brought forth a son", would no doubt indicate the true historical sequence of events, but I venture to say that it would not be true to St. Luke's mode of presentment. In other words, although pluperfects would give the correct order of events, which the Evangelist in no way meant to obscure, yet pluperfects were not in St. Luke's mind when he wrote the sentence. He was starting a new scene, which was to stand as a unit by itself, and he used and meant just simple past tenses.

This manner of writing of St. Luke's is carried on by him into his third chapter, in which he narrates the preaching of the Baptist and the Baptism of our Lord. In between these two accounts, in a manner surprising to us moderns, he inserts that "Herod the tetrarch, when he was reproved by him for Herodias . . . shut up John in prison", iii, 19f. Thus St. Luke's mention of the imprisonment of St. John

actually comes before the account of our Lord's baptism. The explanation, I take it, is that St. Luke conceived the imprisonment as the conclusion of the public preaching of the Baptist and therefore inserted it immediately after his account of the latter. He thus rounds off his description of this phase of St. John's career, and then turns to relate the Baptism of our Lord. In this, as we know from the first two Gospels, St. John played a principal role. But St. Luke did not intend to mention this ; and, therefore, put together in the preceding section or scene all he had to say about St. John at this stage of his narrative. The parallel to St. Luke's treatment of the narrative concerning the birth, circumcision, and naming of St. John does not need emphasizing. Our Lady was present in the home of Saints Zachary and Elizabeth at the time of those events, but her share in them, whatever it was, it did not fall within St. Luke's scope to mention. He therefore finished off what he had to say about our Lady in the previous scene. Similarly here, although the part played by St. John in the Baptism of Christ was secondary only to that of our Lord Himself, St. Luke did not see fit to mention it explicitly ; and, therefore, before passing on to the Baptism he put all he wished to say about the Precursor.

St. Luke's deviations from chronological sequence in his subsequent chapters are of a different order as they rest on a grouping of similar materials. They do not, therefore, illustrate the point of Lucan style with which we are here concerned. They are important in the present connection, however, as additional proof that St. Luke made it no part of his plan to follow a strictly chronological order. These groupings affect such matters as our Lord's power over inanimate nature, devils, and diseases ; examples of the hostility of the Scribes and Pharisees ; His answers to prospective candidates for discipleship. This

point is worked out more in detail in my *A Two Year Public Ministry*, p. 107ff, to which I may be allowed to refer.

Finally it may be pointed out that the third Evangelist's manner of writing in "scenes" as described above has its prototype in that masterpiece of Hebrew, and, indeed, of world literature, which is Genesis. Here, however, on account of their length the word "acts" would often be more appropriate. One example that illustrates the question of chronological order may be given here. The "act" relating to Abraham begins in chapter xii and concludes with the account of his death and burial in xxv, 7-10. Now Abraham died at the age of one hundred and seventy-five years, as is there stated. At the time of Isaac's birth Abraham was a hundred years old, xxi, 5; and "Isaac was three score years old when the children (Esau and Jacob) were born unto him", xxv, 26. The birth of his grandsons therefore took place fifteen years before Abraham's death, but it is narrated subsequently to that event, namely in xxv, 21ff., in the section containing the "act" dealing with the life of Isaac their father.

EDMUND F. SUTCLIFFE, S.J.

HOMILETICS

(NOTE. At the Editor's suggestion, these Homiletics have been condensed into sheer Notes with no literary form. They may easily be the more useful for that.)

25th Sunday after Pentecost

Gospel, Matt. viii, 23-27

Occasion.

Between 1st and 2nd Passovers of Public Life. The Sermon on the Mount, and the cure of the leper by a mere word, had excited political enthusiasm. So Our Lord decided to pass to solitude at other side of Lake. On way to shore, He reminded the Scribe (and others who wish to follow Him) that after putting hand to plough there must be no looking back.

He took His disciples into the boat ; other boats followed, and witnessed miracle.

Storms here are sudden and violent owing to wind bursting from deep valleys between high hills of the shore.

The Miracle.

Our Lord is a Man : He knows weariness and the need of sleep : like us in all save sin.

He is God : heavy seas do subside, with time ; here the calm followed instantly on His command.

He is the Wise Teacher and Gentle Master : He condemned, not all fear, but only that which obscures the view of faith, and upsets peace of soul. The Apostles had faith to say "Lord, save us" ; by lack of faith they added (Mark's account), "Doth it not concern thee that we perish?" Stronger faith would have reminded them that (a) they had yet to fulfil the task to which He had called them ; and (b) sleeping or waking this Man was still Almighty God.

Reflexions.

A. The Fathers see in this miracle a figure both of the soul tossed and threatened by temptation, and of the Church assailed by persecution and apparent disaster, while Our

Lord does nothing, apparently sleeping till aroused by the prayers of the saints (cf. Tertullian, *de Bapt.* cap. 12).

B.1. Today Catholics, "*fideles qui sunt undique*", are being flung this way and that, by what is probably the fiercest storm that ever struck the world. The Church is in, this world, but mercifully not *OF* it. Its stability and energy derive elsewhere : its Master is still Almighty God, *Christus Rex*.

2. Folk with little or no knowledge of the information, commands and advice of Jesus Christ can see nothing clearly defined or personal beyond this life, already all but wrecked by this storm : they need a conscious effort therefore to maintain calm and resolution : and they are led to say that in certain contingencies life would not be worth living. Faith gives a wider and a longer vision : as defined by the Apostle (Heb. xi, 1) it gives a *present* grip on the things to come, i.e. eternal happiness.

3. With little or no faith, people are demanding that Christ's Vicar should join *them* in their frantic efforts to fight this storm *in their way*. But because Christ has longer views and other methods, so has His Vicar. (Development of this will depend on moment.)

C.1. We are in this storm as citizens who are Catholics. We know that our duty to our country is part of our duty to God and our neighbour ; because : (a) It is God's will that has made us citizens of this State ; (b) Every citizen must do his part in maintaining the State and the institutions which serve his needs ; and (c) The State exists for its members, and not vice-versa ; hence our moral duty to share its trials, and, by all means consistent with our state of life under God's law, to resist any attempt to impose the contrary order.

2. As Catholics we know not only that the Church is secure, can afford to wait, will endure all days even to consummation of world ; but also that the Church assures to us our faith, gives us present grip upon future eternal happiness. This life is journey thither : let end of journey find us doing duty dictated by faith.

3. Meantime faith may still call, "Lord save us." He Himself taught us "Deliver us from evil." Catholics have almost monopoly of actual power of prayer. These are

days of storm : Catholics have urgent duty to pray unceasingly for needs of country. Further urgent duty to pray for needs and intentions of Christ's Vicar in the storm : thus "fideles qui sunt undique" will remain united in bond of Christian charity, despite everything.

26th Sunday after Pentecost

Gospel, Matt. xiii, 24-30

Occasion.

About a year later than miracle considered last Sunday. Our Lord again preaching from a boat to crowds on shelving shore.

Parable.

"Cockle" ; a troublesome weed among corn : belongs to rye-grass family : not easily distinguished from wheat till later growth.

Our Lord's explanation : Wheat represents faithful ; Cockle, evil-doers prompted by devil to corrupt the faithful ; Harvest, day of judgement (Matt. xiii, 36ff).

Reflexions.

A.1. Last Sunday's Gospel told of value of Church to world ; today's, that holiness is identifying mark of this true Church, despite presence of sinners, too, among members.

2. Sinners, not product of seed planted by Christ : not in practice easily separable from just : can repent : too hasty elimination of them may loosen loyalty of just.

B.1. Holiness being identifying mark of true Church, this Church will teach :

(a) Theory of holiness ; i.e. doctrine completely holy, having nothing which can encourage or make light of sin, even unintentionally. Illustrations in popular errors about absolution, end justifying means, etc. Contrast doctrine of justification by faith only ; if good works cannot help salvation, bad works cannot hinder it.

(b) Practice of holiness ; i.e. will put within normal

reach of all members, all practical means of holiness delivered by Christ to Apostles. History decides number and nature of these. Apply that to organizations which deny existence of five of these ; or deny Baptism to infants ; or lack power to confer any one of them. No question of opinion here, but of cold historical fact and contemporary observation.

2. Church founded by Christ to make men holy will be efficient : it will succeed in making men holy by force of teaching and work *proper to itself*, not by influences taken or unwittingly received from others.

This does not mean that all Catholics are holy ; still less that no non-Catholics are holy : many are, surprisingly and wonderfully. Careful observation here instructive for us, and positive help for separated brethren. Thus :

(i) Personal holiness among non-Catholics is fruit of bits and pieces of Catholic doctrine, held with, and indeed from, Catholic Church. (Commercial traveller under instruction, seeing the point, spoke of "the goods they pinched when they left the firm" ; exactly.) Not produced by own proper and specifically non-Catholic doctrines : e.g. Not seven Sacraments ; Christ not present in Holy Eucharist ; Bishop of Rome not Christ's Vicar ; Mother of Christ not to be invoked in prayer ; effect of these doctrines either completely negative, or adverse. (But gentle touch advisable in pulpit !)

(ii) So non-Catholic becomes holy, only in so far as he ignores own specific non-Catholic doctrines, and lives according to doctrines taught by Catholic Church. All the odds against him ; hence given degree of holiness in non-Catholic much more wonderful than same degree in Catholic.

(iii) Catholic becomes holy only in so far as he applies every bit of every doctrine of own Church ; will fail, to extent to which he neglects any part. His Church produces holiness by teaching and equipment and activities *proper to itself* ; the mark is identifying because exclusive.

C. Thus riches of true Church overflow beyond own boundaries and membership.

Hence, too, chief cause of preservation and stability of natural virtues in lives of people who "have no religion".

Civilization's debt to Church incurred not exclusively in past when nations were Catholic ; mankind always benefiting by teaching and practice which Catholic Church is always steadily holding before its attention. This thought emerges in next Sunday's Gospel.

27th Sunday after Pentecost

Gospel, Matt. xiii, 31-35

Occasion.

Probably the same as that of last Sunday.

The Parables.

In first Our Lord foretells spread of His Church ; in second, He describes its power to reform mankind.

We know that, gradually and surely, that has been done ; habits and conditions of public and private life have been changed, human society endowed with new spirit of religion and justice. Gospel at first very small thing ; to Jews a stumbling block, to Gentiles foolishness ; yet sublime and beautiful beyond measure ; no doctrine has wider acceptance ; grips mind ; prompts to repentance for sin ; calls for every kind of virtue. Today, after centuries of buffetting among traffic on highways and by-ways of life, has not a word of its creed withdrawn, not a line broken ; the one effective spiritual power in the world ; the one society with world-wide loyalty transcending limitations and vicissitudes of nations and cultures ; the one Authority today to which men may look with any hope of reliable guidance in a world collapsing under weight of material achievements.

Reflexions.

Catholicity. This Universal Church promised even in O.T., wherever mankind's Redeemer is promised : e.g. nations of earth not blessed in any seed of Abraham except in so far as Christ's kingdom is established among all mankind. Christ's intentions clear in commissioning and empowering of Apostles to go and "teach all nations". First Pope aware of it in first sermon on first Christian

Pentecost ; told fellow Jews that promises were to them, and at once added "and to all who are afar off, to all whom the Lord our God shall call". Somewhere in the world, then, is Society, Church, to which all who would be faithful to Christ must belong : "He that heareth you, heareth me ; he that despiseth you despiseth me." Which is it ? Its very Universality makes it conspicuous as a city set on a hill. For instance :

1. (a) Christ's Church will have been working unceasingly ever since time of Christ ; will not have originated from human leader or human law of later date.

(b) Apply that to religious organizations refusing allegiance to Bishop of Rome. Where were they for fifteen hundred years ? (Of Greek "Orthodox" we might ask not only where was it for nine hundred years, but where is it today !)

2. (a) Christ's Church must be at work among all peoples having contact with centre of authority of this Church ; this at all times ; for Catholicity an essential note, not accidental result of growth. Growth there will be, constant evangelical activity, even rebels, Christ foretold all that. (Technicalities here are the difference between *Catholicitas juris* and *C. facti*.) But true Church Catholic from beginning ; at first Pope's first sermon there were "devout men from every nation under heaven". Church is Catholic while it spreads.

(b) This test applied to religious organizations will show many associated with certain racial or national cultures ; carried by settlers and travellers to other parts of earth ; but remaining proper and peculiar to those individuals or groups. Only Church ruled by Bishop of Rome is *at home* among nations ; becomes part of various nations ; gets clergy from them, for them ; yet remains independent of nationalities, and leaves national loyalties intact.

3. (a) True religion will be suited, in teaching and practice, to all mankind, in all ages, whatever be race, or nation, or class, ability, temperament, social conditions, climate, etc.

(b) This test will show many "religions" suited to this that or the other climatic conditions, national ambitions, personal peculiarities shared by large or small groups ;

but only the Church ruled by the Bishop of Rome will be found to possess this objectively universal scope, and suitability, in doctrine, in methods of worship, in practical religious life ; this completely universal and objective appeal to human beings of all types and all times.

Should be noted that Catholicity is proof against all leakage, all losses, all attack. When these influences are more evident (or we more aware of them), as at present, work of Church may be more hidden, but stronger and more far-reaching. Today, increased attention given to Church by those outside, with good or evil intent ; increased variety and energy of activity within the Church : e.g. Apostolatus Maris, Young Catholic Workers, Legion of Mary (marvels all), Catholic Action in general. These things perhaps divine preparation and pre-disposition of Catholic forces in readiness for storm now raging. Our faith surely strengthened and quickened : to produce more confidence, more gratitude, more readily active loyalty and thoroughness in Catholic life.

29th Sunday after Pentecost

Gospel, Matt. xxiv, 15-35

Occasion.

It was two or three days before Our Lord's death. He had just left the Temple, never to return. Looking back at it from Mount Olivet, He foretold the destruction of all this grandeur and beauty, and His own return in triumph to judge all mankind. His Apostles asked when these things should happen and what signs would precede. Answering the second question first, Our Lord describes first the events which would precede the destruction of Jerusalem, and then those which would indicate the end of the world. Today's Gospel passage ends where Our Lord *begins* to speak of the time.

The Text.

"This generation shall not pass till all these things be done." We can probably take it that Our Lord meant just

that. He was speaking of the immediate events, in emphatic distinction (see the Greek) from "that day and hour" (of the end of the world) unknown to all save the Father. It is just unfortunate that today's pericope does not include verse 36, and stop there. Half the trouble here has arisen from that separation.¹

Reflexions.

A. The destruction of Jerusalem is an indication of what the final end of the world will be. Common to both are : (a) almost incredible devastation ; (b) vindication of Christ rejected, first by His own people, then by apostate mankind ; (c) unusual catastrophes, such as widespread persecution of the faithful, pseudo-christs, "abomination" in the holy place, formidable commotion in the sky.

B. The main lesson of this Gospel is that the triumph of right and truth is assured and inevitable, both in general and in detail.

1. In general : God is. And in the end, the information, the commands and the advice which God has put at man's disposal for man's welfare through Jesus Christ, will be demonstrated as valid and final, by the sheer weight of evident and stubborn and overwhelming fact, however successful may seem meantime the effort to reject or neglect those things for a longer or shorter period. It should be remembered that at any period or moment in human history God could give such evidence of His reality and supremacy and finality as would stampede the human intellect, and force it to inescapable assent to the truth. But because He loves mankind, the evidence which He gives leaves room for the working of human good will, the expression and development of human dignity, and the possibility of merit.

2. In detail :

(a) This final cataclysm, manifestly controlled by Jesus Christ, will secure for Him mankind's public acknowledgment of the dignity and the prerogatives and rights which are His as mankind's Sovereign Lord, Saviour, Teacher, Master. Up to that moment it is possible for man to deny and defy Him at every turn (almost !) ; His control has

¹ Cf. Billot, *De Novissimis*, Q. VIII, 2.

remained, of course ; and it is evident in a dozen directions : not only in the power and sweetness of His general providence, not only in His care of the Church, in the achievements of His Saints, in the power of prayer, and so on, but no less in the more terrible reality of the sins which cry to heaven for vengeance, and get it : a vengeance of which natural causes themselves, obeying His law, are the necessary, and mighty, and relentless executioners. And for those sins nations as well as individuals can incur responsibility.

(b) Since right must finally prevail as part of the final triumph of Christ, it follows also that Christ's faithful must be loyal to right in the meantime : they must work and suffer, if need be, to defend and strengthen right. That points to our practical duty in these days of war.

H. E. CALNAN.

DOCTRINE FOR CHILDREN

THESE notes are intended, I am told, for priests giving a lesson in school.

How much time shall we allow for the lesson? There may be 45 minutes available, and of course a highly gifted or skilled priest-teacher can use it.

Most of us had better aim at something shorter: Say 5 or 10 minutes for juniors, 10 or 15 minutes for seniors. We can get one idea across in that time, and we ought to be able to hold the class's attention that long.

Also if our lesson is very short we can go round and give it to another class or two. From the priestcraft point of view a short lesson to several classes is better than a long lesson given to one class.

So we can put away all thought of completeness as to doctrinal treatment. We are not giving a lecture or a thesis, but talking to our children.

To cover all the ground, and make all the information stick, is the task of the class-teacher: incidentally a rather impossible task. The priest can be content to get across one idea at a time, but really across to mind and heart; so that it will infect with its reality the other religious ideas in our hearers' minds.

For these four November weeks our subjects are:

- (1) Souls in Purgatory,
- (2) Fourth Commandment,
- (3) Fifth Commandment,
- (4) Sixth Commandment

with a Senior and a Junior lesson in each case.

I. FIRST WEEK NOVEMBER, SENIORS.

What is Purgatory Like?

(Aim: To teach Catechism answer 106)

We should be interested in Purgatory, since we shall be going there some day—at least we hope so! What is it like there?

We don't know much about it, but we do know something.

(1) It is a place of suffering. (*N.B. These underlined phrases can be put on blackboard, one below the other.*)

The soul suffers because it is torn two ways ; drawn towards God by intense desire, yet held back from going to Him ; consequently intense pain. The Church pictures them saying : Have pity on me, have pity, etc.

(2) What is it holding the soul back ? Sin, of course : mortal sin not atoned for, venial sin not repented of. St. Catherine of Genoa (chief mystical authority on purgatory) calls it the "rust" of sin on the soul, needing to be burnt away by suffering.

To love Someone, and know oneself to be unpleasing in that Someone's sight, is necessarily to suffer. So the souls suffer on account of their sins.

(3) Place of suffering, yes. Place of sorrow, not at all.

On the contrary, purgatory is a place of holy joy, however quiet and subdued. The souls are happy because their sinfulness is vanishing, and heaven is certain, after a while. They know their suffering is only for a time.

(4) The phrases on the blackboard can now be assembled into the full Catechism answer, which can be written out or memorized, etc.

II. FIRST WEEK NOVEMBER, JUNIORS.

Helping the Holy Souls

(Aim : *Not to forget the Holy Souls*)

(1) In November the Church wants us to remember the dead.

"All Souls' Day", i.e. *all* the souls in purgatory. So that even the forgotten souls may be remembered somehow.

(2) A little story. A Cubmistress was talking with her boys about their daily good turn tomorrow.

"Miss, I'll clean my big sister's bicycle," said one.

Another said : "I'll lend my roller-skates to the boy next door—he's always bothering me to", and so on.

"What are you going to do, Jimmy?"

"I don't know anybody who wants being kind to."

"Just fancy, and you go home along Curzon Street past that long high wall! That's the Children's Hospital, didn't you know? You mustn't forget all those boys and girls just because you can't see them. Can't you think of anything to help them pass the time?"

"O.K., miss, I'll take them my comics."

We mustn't forget to help the Holy Souls just because we can't see them.

(3) Some ways of helping them: prayers, communions, self-denials, gaining indulgences.

(4) Say a prayer for them now, after me: O merciful God—have pity on the souls in Purgatory—who are suffering for a time—on account of their sins—Bring them soon to heaven—to the eternal Rest—and the perpetual Light—to be happy with You for ever—May they rest in peace.

III. SECOND WEEK NOVEMBER, SENIORS.

About the Fourth Commandment

(Aim: To get children to see parental authority as reasonable)

(1) In every sphere there must be what we call *authority*, someone responsible in charge: apply this rapidly to nation, football team, classroom, etc.

It is true also of any home. In fact the home is the earliest authority of all in our lives. Children are put under care of the parents.

By whom? By God.

(2) A child *needs* parents. Animals mostly grow up in a few months (give instances) but just look at a human baby—he's going to be helpless for years. (*Some opportunity for the humorist here?*)

(3) At your age you probably feel pretty well grown now and ready for anything, and so you are in a way. But that is only temporary—in a year or two you'll start growing again, and need parents and friends as much as ever.

(4) Sometimes a boy or girl may be misunderstood by

parents. Remember parents have to learn their job by experience ; learning to adapt themselves to a growing son or daughter may be hard ; harder than learning to ride a bicycle.

Mary and Joseph, even, didn't understand Our Lord, but "He was subject to them".

(5) One person in a house can make it miserable ; or happy. So don't make the whole house miserable just because you are growing up.

Soon you will be grown up, and then you will be glad that you didn't make trouble at home. When you obey your parents, and love them and reverence them, you are acting according to God's will, because it was God who entrusted you to their care. (*Catechism 197.*)

IV. SECOND WEEK NOVEMBER, JUNIORS.

About the Fourth Commandment

(Aim : To explain the idea of Authority)

Here's a made-up story to help you understand the Fourth Commandment.

Peter was going to school across the Park, and chased a butterfly across some flower-beds.

"Come off there !" yelled a park-keeper. "Those plants were only put in yesterday—can't you give them a chance to grow ?"

Peter ran still faster, out of the Park. He thought what a nuisance grown-up people are, always shouting at you and stopping you doing things.

At school he went to the wood-work room, as it was Mr. McElligott's wood-work morning. He hadn't arrived, and some boys were larking about. Peter loved wood-work, so he got out his tools and was soon busy on a stool he had almost finished. Suddenly a pellet hit him behind the ear ; his chisel slipped and spoiled one of the stool-legs.

"Oh, steady on, you chaps !" he said, but they continued their riot, and he thought, "I wish Mr. McElligott would come in and stop this row."

Just then Mr. McElligott did come, and the class settled down to work. Peter started on the leg again, and the stool was soon finished. He looked round and saw the photo-frames and boxes and stools that were coming into shape under the other boys' hands.

"You can't make things properly unless somebody keeps order," he thought.

Going home again across the Park, he looked at the plants he had nearly trampled down.

"I suppose the park-keeper was right," he said to himself. "They would never get a chance to grow if he wasn't there to look after them."

So Peter had discovered the real purpose of lawful "authority" (*put this word on the board in big capitals*) which is to foster life and help things to grow.

God puts us first under the authority of our parents ; they keep us alive and help us to grow up. Then by God's will we have other lawful superiors—king, bishop, Town Council, policemen, etc.—and it is God who gives them their authority.

But first of all come our parents ; when we obey them we are obeying God.

Now a little prayer to end up with : O my God—I promise to keep the Fourth Commandment—I will love my father and mother—I will obey them and all my other lawful superiors—because it is Your holy Will—O God, my Father in heaven.

V. THIRD WEEK NOVEMBER, SENIORS.

About the Fifth Commandment

(*Aim : To introduce or illustrate Catechism answers 206–207*)

In one of the big "dog-fights" over the Channel in August 1940, a Spitfire was seen to collide head on with a German bomber, and both fell in flames. Observers said the Spitfire's action seemed quite deliberate ; the pilot had finished his ammunition, and determined to ram a German machine, with its bombs and crew of five, at the cost of his own life.

Discuss with class various questions :

(1) Did the pilot sin by murder? No, but why not?

(Man's life is God's gift, and only God has a right to take it away; but if somebody else is trying to take it away we can defend it, even by killing the aggressor. This covers the cases of just war, and execution of criminals; self-defence on the part of nation or community.)

(2) Did he sin at least by suicide?

(We must not take even our own life, since life belongs to God. But the pilot was not killing himself; he was doing something he had a right to do—destroying the bomber—with his own death as a foreseen result. Far from sinning, he was acting nobly—laying down his life for his friends.)

(3) Let us imagine that he acted out of sudden anger, at seeing the bombers destroying the convoy. Would that be sinful?

(Anger sometimes helps action, e.g. in a fight, and then it is right to use angry feelings so long as we keep control of them.)

(4) Or suppose he hated the Germans so much that he wanted to kill them at any cost?

(Hatred—really wishing evil to anybody—is always sinful, even towards our enemies. We should desire their conversion, even while we fight them.)

(5) Or suppose he was doing it out of revenge for the death of some friend?

(Revenge, like hatred, is a sin if the will consents; but not involuntary revengeful feelings.)

So the Catechism: "The fifth Commandment forbids anger, and, still more, hatred and revenge."

VI. THIRD WEEK NOVEMBER, JUNIORS.

About the Fifth Commandment

(Aim: To show where anger uncontrolled leads to)

Dan had a new boat, and asked two other boys for an afternoon up the river. At the picnic place he said: "I'll go ashore and get some milk for our tea—see you later." As soon as he was gone Tom and Harry began to quarrel

about who should have the oars. The argument became heated, Tom struck Harry across the face, the boat rocked violently and Harry fell splash into the water.

Just then Dan came back, in time to see what happened and to help Harry up the bank. "You must be crazy!" he shouted to Tom. "Harry might easily have been caught in the weeds and drowned!"

Harry had to have tea in his mackintosh while his clothes dried in the sun. Tom felt ashamed and he began to see how bad temper can lead to quarrelling, fighting, and even manslaughter or murder.

These passions are in every one of us and we must start learning to manage them.

VII. FOURTH WEEK NOVEMBER, SENIORS.

About the Sixth Commandment

(Aim : To show the reasonableness of it)

(1) God's Ten Commandments are not just a set of rules made to try us. They are all based on reason; they are reason.

What is the reason for the Sixth Commandment?

(2) The reason is : the Family.

Nothing more precious in life than a home ; a man and a woman and their children.

(3) To bring up a family takes 20 to 30 years. So the man and woman must keep their marriage promise, and stick together.

(4) That is what the Sixth Commandment is all about : it is to guard Family life. (*Display this on blackboard in some striking way.*)

To married people God says : You made a promise to each other and to Me—keep it all your life.

To unmarried people : All your bodily powers and desires are good, I gave them to you, so that you may be happily married some day. They are not meant to use solely for your own pleasure, disregarding My purposes.

To children : Soul must be master of body. When

you give way to laziness, or gluttony, you are practising self-indulgence instead of self-control.

(5) Recommend a daily Hail Mary in honour of the purity of Our Lady, or some similar practice.

VIII. FOURTH WEEK NOVEMBER, JUNIORS.

About the Sixth Commandment

(Aim : To teach need of self-control)

A boy I knew was going off one Bank Holiday for a long bicycle-ride into the country with his pals. He was rather late, and rode fast to get to the meeting place. Free-wheeling down a hill, he knew very well he ought to slow up, but he was in a hurry, and took a chance even round the bend. It had rained in the night and the road was greasy—suddenly the back wheel went from under him—a bad skid, bicycle broken, cuts and bruises, a wasted Bank-holiday.

Our soul ought to control our body, otherwise our bodily passions will run away with us and land us in disaster. Every time we are greedy in eating, etc., we are letting our body get the better of our soul.

I remember some girls who went blackberrying, and Edna proudly displayed a big bottle full : "Enough to make a big pie for the whole family," she said. She had so many she thought she could safely eat a few, although she had eaten lots while picking them. On the tram going back she kept on taking another. Soon there was only enough for a small pie, but she couldn't stop herself eating them, and at last there were so few she said, "I may as well finish them up now." So there was no pie for Sunday, and she had a stomach-ache too that night.

We must make our body do what we want, not what it wants ; otherwise it will lead us some day to break the Sixth Commandment.

FRANCIS H. DRINKWATER.

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

I. DOGMATIC THEOLOGY

IN his Notes on Recent Work in Philosophy last April Dr. Phillips drew attention to an excellent series of booklets (*Signposts*), written by young philosophers and theologians of the Church of England and published monthly during this year by the Dacre Press at the price of one shilling. The first volume (*The Fate of Modern Culture*) was dealt with under the heading of Philosophy because Mr. Casserley's general introduction was confined to an examination of modern systems of thought, especially so far as they are inimical to Christianity. We have since received five further volumes of the series whose subject matter belongs strictly to the province of dogmatic theology, and which have therefore been reserved for review in this section. Let it be said immediately, and before we make the reservations which it is necessary to make, that these booklets cannot fail to do a great deal of good. Well produced, well written, the work of sincere and able theologians who have no sympathy with Modernist attempts to whittle away the traditional Christian theology, *Signposts* will bring an understanding of many vital Catholic doctrines to those who are unlikely to read our Catholic books. We may go even further and candidly acknowledge that certain of these writers succeed where many of our Catholic authors fail, in explaining difficult points of theology in language which the layman can understand, and also in relating that theology to the facts of common experience.

Perhaps the least convincing of the five before us is Mr. MacKinnon's treatise on *God the Living and the True*. Mr. Mascall, who is one of the general editors of the series, appears to have expected that this volume would contain some treatment of the "attributes which a Christian alleges to belong to God".¹ In actual fact it contains nothing of the sort; and the reason appears to be that Mr. MacKinnon allows himself to be so much obsessed by the (admittedly) difficult question of the relation between nature and grace,

¹ *Signpost II: Man, His Origin and Destiny*, p. 25.

between reason and revelation, that his essay becomes apologetical and hardly begins to be theological at all. It would be unfair to accuse the writer of a Barthian irrationalism; he accepts the possibility and the validity of a natural theology. But he is faint-hearted in his hesitation to carry the achievements of that natural theology into the sphere of revealed truth; the tension between nature and grace appears to him to forbid it. His preoccupation may best be described in his own words. "If theology", he writes, "does indeed consist in the application of the reason to the understanding of the truths of revelation, then, before reason can operate, the reality of that revelation must be admitted. . . . If this is irrationalism, the author is glad to plead guilty to the accusation. But he would ask the reader to define clearly the irrationalism of which he is guilty. He does not deny the validity of natural theology. All that he is concerned to stress is the primacy for the Christian of revelation, and of the fact that such is the character of the relation of nature and grace that the recovery of an adequate appreciation of the human reason may be contingent on the acquisition of the theological virtue of supernatural faith." There is much here that is worthy of close consideration. It is true that, just as internal grace has a healing as well as an elevating function, so the external grace of revelation is intended to correct the errors and supply the deficiencies of the human mind even within the sphere of natural truth. But the primacy of revelation in Christian theology does not exclude, indeed it presupposes, the use of the human reason in the process that leads to the acceptance of the Christian revelation itself. It is here, we suggest, that Mr. MacKinnon's plea for the acceptance of the Christian God is lacking in force. "We are not to think of revelation", he says,¹ "simply as disclosure; we are to think of it rather as saving act." Surely the Incarnation and the Redemption (the saving act) are not to be confused with revelation. That Christ is truly God and truly man, that the Word Incarnate, in the humanity which He assumed, suffered and died for our salvation, these are dogmas of faith which God has revealed to us; they are

¹ P. 68.

part of the content of revealed truth, they are not the act of revelation itself. It is true that God has revealed himself to us in Christ, but in the sense that He has made His only begotten Son in human flesh the mouthpiece of His definitive utterance to mankind: "Divina nobis credenda per modum locutionis revelantur".¹ And man's response to the divine *locutio* is that intellectual assent, prompted by the will and assisted by divine grace, which we call the act of faith, and for which motives of credibility accepted by the human reason are a necessary prerequisite.

The same sense of constraint, forbidding the author to attempt any expression of supernatural realities in terms of natural categories, is perceptible in the second of Mr. MacKinnon's contributions to the series, *The Church of God*²; with the result that, although the book contains many pages of real power and deep insight, especially on the Church considered as the Body of Christ, one is left nevertheless with a feeling of frustration at the vagueness with which the author formulates his views on such vital matters as the constitution of the Church, the essence of the priesthood, and the general doctrine of the sacraments.

A surer touch and a firmer grasp of orthodox doctrine are apparent in Mr. Mascall's volumes on *Man: His Origin and Destiny*³ and on *The God-man*⁴. In the first of these the third chapter⁵ may be especially recommended as an excellent statement of the Catholic doctrine on the essential unity of man, and similarly the fourth and fifth, in which the author draws from that doctrine the conclusions which affect man's social and family life. In the same writer's treatise on the Incarnation the Catholic theologian will find little to criticize and much to commend, the first fifty pages in particular containing an admirably clear exposition of the Hypostatic Union with a brief history of early Christological heresies.

The Fall and the Redemption, touched upon by Mr. Mascall in both the booklets mentioned, form the main subject of Mr. Parker's *The Re-Creation of Man*⁶. It is no easy matter to give a popular exposition of two such intricate

¹ *Contra Gentes*, iv. 1.

² "Body and Soul."

³ No. 7.

⁴ No. 3.

⁵ No. 5.

⁶ No. 6.

doctrines within the limits of 120 pages ; yet Mr. Parker goes far towards achieving it. So clear is the author's method of treatment, so striking the illustrations which he uses in order to explain profound truths to the non-theological reader, that we should like to be able to say that he has fulfilled his task with complete success. On the subject of original sin the pessimism of the classical Protestant theory is completely rejected, as is likewise the optimism of the neo-Pelagians of the Liberal school. Nor has Mr. Parker any use for the theories of Redemption which correspond to each of these heresies. One thing only appears to us to mar what would otherwise be a completely Catholic statement, and that is the lack of a clear distinction between the natural, the preternatural and the supernatural. A failure to recognize the primitive "integrity" of man as preternatural and gratuitous forces him logically to the conclusion that in consequence of original sin man has "fallen below the human level",¹ has become "less than a man". Nor is one able rightly to discern in what man's "supernatural communion with God", described by the author as a "sharing of the capacity of the angels", differs from the knowledge of God which he is able to acquire by the use of his natural faculties.

The author rightly points out² that it is not only the penalty of original sin but also its guilt which is said to be present in each human being at birth. But the solidarity of the human race which he invokes to explain that "we suffer from all the sins of past generations as surely as we do from our own" fails to explain how we can inherit *guilt*. The transmission of the guilt of original sin becomes intelligible only when the state of sin, as distinct from the act of sin, has been shown to consist in the privation of sanctifying grace, in this case a privation brought about by the wilful act of him who is the source of our nature. Few Catholic theologians, moreover, will be found to agree with Mr. Parker's theory of divine punishment. "God", he writes, "punishes men for sin, just in so far as he does not intervene to protect them against the natural results of their actions ; and normally he does not so intervene." Active retributory punishment, understood as the will of a just God to

¹ P. 57.² P. 60.

restore the order of the universe by positively inflicting suffering upon those who have been guilty of illegitimate self-indulgence—whether such punishment be inflicted on earth, in Purgatory or in Hell—has nothing in common with the petty revenge, cruelty or spite with which Mr. Parker appears to think that it must necessarily be confused. Petty revenge is sinful because it is an individual expression of the hatred of one human being for another; retributory punishment is virtuous because it is an act of public authority which legitimately redresses the balance of justice.

If in reviewing these really excellent booklets we have dwelt at some length upon what seem to us their deficiencies, it is out of no wish to disguise their undoubted value. Indeed their very excellence is a reason for pointing out the adjustments which they appear to need if they are to be perfectly in line with the authentic Christian tradition.

Of heavier calibre viewed as a theological study, but considerably less favourable to the Catholic standpoint, is *Fathers and Heretics*, the Bampton Lectures for 1940 delivered by Dr. G. L. Prestige.¹ Yet the author's consistent failure to appreciate the part played by the Roman see during the doctrinal controversies with which the greater part of his book is concerned detracts little from the value of his work of historical and doctrinal analysis; the student of positive theology will still consult it with profit. The controversies which form the subject of Dr. Prestige's lectures may be best indicated by giving their titles: (1) *Callistus: or, Faith in a divine Saviour*. (2) *Origen: or, the claims of religious intelligence*. (3) *Athanasius; or, the Unity of God*. (4) *Apollinaris: or, Divine Irruption*. (5) *Nestorius: or, Redeemed Humanity*. (6) *Cyril: or, One Lord, One Faith, One Baptism*. These are preceded by a prologue, *Tradition: or, the Scriptural basis of Theology*, and followed by an epilogue entitled *Eros: or, Devotion to the Sacred Humanity*.

The prologue is important for it sets forth the author's views on the source of revelation. Basically this is Scripture alone, Tradition being admitted only as furnishing an "inspired" interpretation of the sacred books. One looks in vain, however, for any reference in this chapter to a living

¹ S.P.C.K., vii. + 432 pp. 12s. 6d. net.

and infallible teaching authority, and the absence of this fundamentally Catholic conception affects the writer's whole attitude towards the development of Christian doctrine; revealed truth remains at the mercy of warring philosophies and conflicting political interests, with nothing but a vague "instinct of the Gospel" to serve as a salutary check. Dr. Prestige's lecture on Callistus is noteworthy for an instructive study of Gnosticism and of the relations between Hellenism and Christianity; though his presentment of early penitential discipline and practice would have gained from a recognition of recent Catholic scholarship in this field, notably the work of D'Alès and Galtier. Of Origen he draws a sympathetic portrait, in which perhaps antipathy to Rome leads to over-emphasis upon light at the expense of shade. If the excesses of Origen had never been condemned, then all that was good in his work would probably have perished; surely the pruning knife of anathema was needful so that the fruit of that speculative genius might ripen in the organic development of revealed truth. The essay on Athanasius affords scope for an interesting account of the impact of the revelation of the Trinity upon the philosophical tendencies of the time; and here Dr. Prestige is at his best. Nevertheless a tail-piece on the developments of Trinitarian theology in the West might not have been out of place; and the author's summary, "The entire difference between the Persons is not one of content but of manner. Nothing whatever exists to differentiate between the Father, the Son and the Spirit except the difference of aspect with which each presents the whole reality of God",¹ would have been more clearly innocent of the Sabellianism which the author explicitly rejects, had he at least alluded to the opposition of relation upon which western theology so rightly insists.

The remaining essays are Christological, and here again much that is admirable and valuable is marred, at any rate from a Catholic point of view, by such jibes at the Roman primacy as "The Roman Popes themselves had always skilfully absorbed the advantages while rejecting the embarrassments of their secular situation; their power had in

¹ P. 190.
Vol. xix.

fact been acquired mainly through residence in the civic headquarters of empire and civilization, but they had always claimed to rest its exercise on the more religious ground that they represented the primatial authority of the apostolic martyrs, Peter and Paul" ¹ (a claim, by the way, strikingly supported by Irenaeus, who in other matters is abundantly quoted by Dr. Prestige), or the following : "Rome never condoned anything that it believed to be heresy ; having few theological gifts of its own it maintained a faithful guardianship over other people's".² The author's analysis of the doctrines of Apollinaris, Nestorius and Cyril is profound, and in particular one is grateful for the reminder that the heresies of the two former, unlike that of Arius, resulted from a conscientious attempt to formulate the orthodox teaching of Christianity. One may well admit, however, that it was the honest endeavour of each to safeguard both the integrity of Christ's human nature and the unity of His Person, without at the same time questioning the justice of the verdict which condemned them for heresy ; nor, while admitting that the antagonism between the rival sees of Constantinople and Alexandria was a powerful factor in the Nestorian situation, is it necessary (as has been shown by Catholic scholars who have written since the discovery of the "Bazaar of Heracleides") to maintain that Cyril's impetuosity was not prompted also by a sense of duty : in view of the commission received from Rome he regarded himself as the accredited agent of the Holy See.

The Council of Chalcedon and Pope Leo the Great are sharply criticized by Dr. Prestige for their failure to provide a "positive and convincing rationalization of the right faith". Nothing could reveal more clearly the author's conception of the function of an ecumenical council ; and it would be difficult to find a conception further removed from the true one. At no time has the Catholic Church claimed to render supernatural mysteries positively accessible to the human understanding ; indeed to do so would be to eviscerate them of their essential significance. It would be nearer the truth to say that the office of the teaching Church is precisely to save the divine mysteries

¹ P. 254.

² P. 262.

from being rationalized, to guard them against a rationalism which would reduce divine truth to a merely human level, to define the sphere within which theological speculation is allowed free play. Ephesus had set limits to the dualistic speculations of Antioch, and it was the providential task of Chalcedon to check those thinkers who would have confused the natures that are distinct. The voice of the successor of St. Peter failed to prevent the secession of many in the East ; but that voice was not the less infallible because it spoke from the West.

In concluding his epilogue, a rapid and most interesting outline of the history of devotion to the Sacred Humanity, Dr. Prestige has some very timely reflections on private devotion as distinct from liturgical worship. It is true that private devotion, like private speculation, needs to be guided and restrained ; only when authorized by the Church can it be regarded as a canon of Christian belief. But it should be remarked also that devotion in the Church, like doctrine, is subject to a legitimate development, and so long as it develops in accordance with the prescriptions of infallible authority it is the genuine fruit of divine revelation—whether that fruit appear in the fifth, the twelfth, the sixteenth, or even the twentieth century.

G. D. SMITH.

II. PHILOSOPHY

It is not surprising that with the spread of German culture in Europe the stream of philosophical literature should have much diminished ; rather one may wonder that even a trickle remains. Of course nothing has come lately from the continent of Europe, and it has been left to an English publisher—George Allen and Unwin—to give us some home-produced work.

The first series of Gifford Lectures by Professor John Laird, delivered last year, has been published under the title of *Theism and Cosmology*.¹ The subject of these lectures

¹ George Allen and Unwin. 10s. 6d. net.

is, generally speaking, a consideration of what is roughly called, in Kantian language, the Cosmological Argument for Theism. The argument is not found to be, in the end, demonstrative, and this negative conclusion is perhaps the most definite result arrived at in the discussion. Professor Laird has a way of approaching his conclusions and then backing away from them, like a horse scampering backwards and forwards in a field without ever getting up to the hedge. It certainly occasions no surprise that Dr. Laird should shrink from proof of the existence of God, as proof and certainty have so long been out of fashion in philosophical circles : indeed, as he remarks, "surprise may be shewn that anyone should seriously consider attempted demonstrations of Theism in this twentieth century".

The first lecture is devoted to a discussion of Natural Theology, which the author is inclined to regard as a legitimate way of enquiring into the ultimate grounds of the world, though its boundaries are, he thinks, not very precise. In the second lecture, on Theism, he wishes the term to be taken in its widest possible sense to embrace any theory that there is a God or Gods in any intelligible sense. It would thus include polytheism, pantheism and deism. Though no doubt we all have the power, which Humpty-Dumpty claimed, of making a word mean "what we choose it to mean—neither more nor less" ; if we exercise it we have to find a new word to express the old meaning. Theism is normally taken to mean an acknowledgment of a God distinct from the world, and so, to exclude pantheism ; while the cosmological arguments are supposed to conclude to some attribute of such an Absolute Being. To start with the presumption that these arguments may give us a finite God, or a "God in the making" seems at least to risk a total misunderstanding of their purport, and the resulting judgement that they are invalid is not surprising. In fact, Dr. Laird has to begin with a prejudicial assumption that an absolutely perfect existent is impossible, and it is this which dominates—and invalidates—the whole discussion.

He rightly asserts that the cosmological arguments have an existential premiss : "the world exists", and what may be called an essential premiss : "the world is not self-sufficient" ; where all that is found not to be self-sufficient comes under

this term "the world", including therefore both the Finite God and the God of pantheism. The reason for Professor Laird's rejection of the accepted meaning of Theism is to be seen in his conception of existence—which he regards as being all of a kind, i.e. a positive essence, not merely an act which places an essence outside its causes and *extra nihil*—and in his fundamental belief that "coming-to-be is the marrow and essence of all actuality". If this be so, there can be no further question of the demonstrative value of the classical arguments for the existence of God, since these are founded on the insufficiency of all being in which "coming to-be" is an ingredient; i.e. on the distinction between act and potency. Once the notion of Absolute Perfection is repudiated as an impossibility it is futile to enquire whether it exists. We cannot here enter into all the considerations which have confirmed Dr. Laird in his fundamental belief that becoming is the essence of all actuality, but two may, perhaps, be mentioned. He is convinced that "what exists does exist, and cannot have semi-existence"; existence is thus all of a kind, not conditioned by essence. He does not admit that the existence of a thing is proportionate to its nature. Secondly, he is unable to reconcile God's com-presence with the process of "becoming" unless he is a sharer in the process. The Thomist, of course, replies that the mind has as its object being—not becoming—and indeed can only deal with the latter in terms of being. The alternative is complete unintelligibility. Dr. Laird's objections to the arguments for God are familiar enough, but they are set out here in an unfamiliar way and with much freshness and spirit. The book is stimulating, even gay, and affords an excellent opportunity to the theist to dig once more to the roots of his doctrine, and so to sharpen his wits—and perhaps his claws.

A second book from the same publisher is concerned with the other fundamental idea of all religion—the human soul.¹ This is an historical account of a metaphysical idea seen through the eyes of a biologist. It contains a great deal of valuable information about the mechanistic interpretation

¹ *The Idea of the Soul in Western Philosophy and Science.* By William Ellis, Ph.D. 12s. 6d. net.

of man, which began with Descartes and has been carried to its extreme by Behaviourism. We have here a clear account of the researches of Pavlov, Child and Watson ; while the entelechy theory of Driesch is sympathetically dealt with. The author is a mechanist of a rather hesitant, not to say contradictory, kind, though some misunderstanding may be caused by his not distinguishing clearly the views of those he is discussing from his own. In any case his sympathies seem, oddly enough, to be rather with the imaginative and "idealist" thinkers than with the rationalists. He is a Platonist rather than an Aristotelian in mentality, though he does not adopt the Platonic idea of the Soul. Our knowledge of the pre-Socratic philosophers is so incomplete that no particular interpretation of them can lay claim to certainty. Nevertheless, Dr. Ellis' presentation of their views is not lacking in plausibility, though the same cannot be said of his account of primitive ideas of the soul ; he is always inclined to read history backwards.

When he comes to deal with philosophies of which we have more knowledge, and where therefore he is more open to challenge, his own sympathies and prejudices are more apparent. While he treats sympathetically the Socratic and Platonic ideas of the soul, his sketch of Aristotle's views can hardly be called anything but a travesty. He opens this section by saying that in "Aristotle's philosophy there are no fundamental concepts which are not taken from Plato, and Aristotle's handling of these concepts adds little but verbal subtlety to the thought of his master." He asserts that the Aristotelian "Form" "is simply the structure of the individual as opposed to its stuff", and in consequence of this distortion is led to assert that Aristotle ended in a dualistic conception of nature. "Aristotle's world is a self-contradictory dualism of material and immaterial, precariously bound together by the strained threads of Aristotle's verbal subtlety."

The account which follows of the rise of Christian thought is even more bizarre. The leading place in it is given to the Logos doctrine of Philo, and we have a purely imaginative account of the early development of Christian doctrine, bearing little relation to the historical facts. The sketch of its later development is hardly more satisfactory. It is very

slight, and seems to be derived more from the imagination of the writer than from the works of the thinkers whom he mentions. What are we to say, for example, of this pronouncement: "Aquinas reconciled his account of the soul with the immortality of man by recourse to the doctrine of reincarnation"?

In the modern period Dr. Ellis deals at length, and much more objectively, with the doctrine of Descartes, from whom the mechanistic account of nature which has been predominant up to the present day is clearly derived. Here we have a lucid survey of the successive advances of the mechanistic view, as wave by wave it has invaded the outposts of vitalism. First it absorbed organic chemistry, then with Loeb reflex behaviour, with Pavlov conscious behaviour, and now with Watson and the Behaviourists it is absorbing intelligent behaviour. Dr. Ellis, though he equates the mechanistic with the natural, so that all that is not mechanical is non-natural, i.e. not of this world, does not nevertheless find philosophical behaviourism of any kind to be ultimately satisfactory. In its place he propounds a tentative solution of his own, which, strangely enough, has certain similarities with the views of the despised Aristotle. Animation, he contends, is to be found throughout nature, and not merely in living things, and the hierarchy of beings is constituted not by fundamental disjunctions but by continuous gradations.

Here, then, is a book which, in spite of some fanciful misconceptions and obvious omissions, such as that of any mention of Plotinus and Neo-Platonism, gives a readable account of the history of the idea of the soul, and attempts "to provide an observational basis for metaphysics".

R. P. PHILLIPS.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

"SCRIBERE" IN CANON 1386 §1

The law of canon 1386 §1, which forbids the clergy to write on secular subjects without the permission of their Ordinaries, does not express very clearly what is forbidden. Does it include, for example, an occasional letter to the Press? If not, what is the usual interpretation of this law? (H.V.)

REPLY

Canon 1386 §1. Vetantur clerici saeculares sine consensu suorum Ordinariorum, religiosi vero sine licentia sui Superioris maioris et Ordinarii loci, libros quoque, qui de rebus profanis tractent, edere, et in diariis, foliis vel libellis periodicis scribere vel eadem moderari.

As we had occasion to point out in this REVIEW, 1934, Vol. VII, page 251, the law of canon 1386 is quite distinct from that of canon 1385, which requires all writings of a religious or moral character to be submitted to previous censorship, i.e. to a judgement concerning the orthodoxy of what is written. The clergy are bound, in addition, to obtain permission from their Ordinaries before publishing works which are of a secular character requiring no previous censorship. The law of the Code is, in fact, stricter than the previous legislation in art. 42 of Leo XIII's Constitution *Officiorum et munerum*, and in the anti-Modernist legislation of Pius X.¹ The requisite permission is occasionally given by an Ordinary to all clerics under his jurisdiction²; or, more usually, it is given for the habitual use of the cleric who requests it; but the Ordinary may, if he desires, limit his permission to each occasion.

(i) An examination of the commentators on the *common law* reveals a certain divergence in defining what is meant by "scribere".

(a) There is complete agreement amongst them that permission is required by a cleric who writes *habitually* for

¹ Cf. Brys in *Collationes Brugenses*, 1933, p. 409.

² Sipos, *Enchiridion*, p. 732 n. 12.

the Press, and some hold the view that the law is to be understood exclusively in this sense. Thus Cappello, *Summa Iuris Canonici*, II, n. 770 "Attenditur collaboratio habitualis vel saltem frequens".

(b) Others, more correctly in our opinion, include even one contribution which is of some importance, particularly of religious importance. Génicot, *Institutiones Theologiae Moralis*, I, n. 460: "quaedam alicuius momenti vel habitualiter". Vermeersch-Creusen, *Epitome*, II, n. 728: "saltem habitualiter vel de argumento peculiaris momenti religiosi vel moralis". Wernz-Vidal, *Jus Canonicum*, Vol. IV, §.715, n. 34: "intelligenda videtur de scriptione habituali seu frequenti aut etiam minus frequenter de argumento peculiaris momenti religiosi vel moralis". Blat, *Commentarium*, III, n. 282: "scribere saltem ad modum correspondentium seu collaboratorum, etsi ratione verborum etiam semel videretur sufficere". Davis, *Moral and Pastoral Theology*, II, page 413: "contributions notable or frequent, to newspapers, etc."

(c) *De minimis non curat lex*. Those commentators who have more carefully examined the subject in all its bearings point out that the law would become absurd if it were made to apply to the slightest and most trivial writings. By comparing §1 of the canon with the following §2 it is apparent that the prohibition against writing anything, "quidpiam", applies only to anti-religious or immoral journals. Wouters, *Manuale Theologiae Moralis*, II, n. 1115: "Una alterave minor elucubratio in diariis, etc., non videtur voce scribendi comprehendi . . ." Augustine, *Commentary*, VI, p. 442: "To say that the publication of a notice of a church festival or parish event, or funeral, requires the special consent of the Ordinary or religious superior would render the law ridiculous." The same applies to a priest who wants to write to the papers to say that he has heard a cuckoo or seen a snowdrop.

But it is necessary, we think, to bear in mind that a series of short contributions might be considered, taken all together, to constitute notable matter, even though each one singly is of no consequence. Sipos, *Enchiridion*, loc. cit.: "Verbum 'scribere' cooperationem significat, quae iam repetitis etiam minoribus lucubrationibus habetur". Brys,

loc. cit. : "prohibitio . . . nunc ad omnem cooperationem alicuius momenti extenditur, quae jam v.g. repetitis etiam minoribus lucubrationibus habebitur". Coronata, *Institutiones*, II, p. 319 : "Unumve alterumve articulum minoris momenti in diariis inserere non videtur dici posse in *diariis scribere* in sensu Codicis, et proinde licentia in his casibus non videtur requiri, sed pro habituali scriptione seu collaboratione". The point to be considered is whether a series of short contributions is a matter of some moment when taken all together ; announcements of parish events are clearly not of this description, whereas a protracted correspondence might easily be of more consequence than one single and longer contribution.

It seems to us that the interpretation of the common law given by Fr. Davis, "contributions notable or frequent", best describes the meaning of "scribere" in this context.

(ii) It is open to local ecclesiastical authorities to make the general terms of the common law more particular and definite for clerics subject to their jurisdiction. The English bishops in 1918, and more recently in their Low Week Meeting of this year, called the attention of the clergy to the law of canon 1386, without, however, defining its terms. Occasional references to the subject may be seen in certain diocesan regulations. For example, the *Decreta et Praecepta* of Liverpool (1923) and of Nottingham (1924), after quoting the canon, give the following direction : "Thus it is clear that before writing to the Press on ANY subject a priest must obtain the consent of the Ordinary, or of his delegate, who, in such cases, is the Dean of the district."

The directions of the *Malines Provincial Council IV*, n. 232, are much more precise and are often quoted by canonists as a wise and practical application of the common law : "Declaramus autem praevidiam Ordinarii licentiam non requiri ad nuntiandum quemvis vitae quotidianae eventum (*faits divers*), vel aliquod bonum opus ab Ordinario approbatum commendandum, vel aliud quid minimi obiter inserendum, sed eam requiri (i) ut quis clericus vel religiosus habitualiter aut repetitis vicibus in diario vel libello periodico scribat ; (ii) ut respondeat calumniis aut contumeliis quibus in aliquo diario forte impetitus fuerit ; (iii) ut vel unum articulum de re religiosa, sociali vel

politica actu agitata aut peculiaris momenti conscribat. Si vero propter rei urgentiam existimaverit quis sibi fas esse licentiam praesumere, articulum sine mora, addito auctoris nomine, ad Ordinarium mittat. Profecto Ecclesia huiusmodi statuto nullatenus intendit cleri operam scientificam, litterariam, sociale, aliamve religioni vel civitati proficuum, cohibere aut quovis modo impedire, sed tantum eandem debitis cautelis circumdare."

E. J. M.

DIOCESAN COLLECTIONS

Would you indicate the texts of the common law which authorize the diocesan collections in parish churches at stated times? (P. P.)

REPLY

Canon 1496 : Ecclesiae ius quoque est, independens a civili potestate, exigendi a fidelibus quae ad cultum divinum, ad honestam clericorum aliorumque ministrorum sustentationem et ad reliquos fines sibi proprios sint necessaria.

Canon 1503 : Salvis praescriptis can. 621-624, vetantur privati tam clerici quam laici sine Sedis Apostolicae aut proprii Ordinarii et Ordinarii loci auctoritate, in scriptis data, stipem cogere pro quolibet pio aut ecclesiastico instituto vel fine.

Canons 1499-1507, under the title "De Bonis Ecclesiasticis Acquirendis", mention various taxes and tributes which the Ordinary is entitled to receive from parish priests. Actually, the only canon which covers the above question is 1503, which, by denying the right to private persons, implies that the Holy See and Ordinaries possess the authority to order collections to be made for religious purposes. The commentators establish this right in their explanations of this canon, e.g. Coronata, *Institutiones*, II, §1042 : "Ordinarius non solum permittere, sed et praecipere potest ut parochi pro aliquo determinato fine aut opere pio stipem intra vel extra ecclesiam paroecialem cogant."

Cf. also Cappello, *Jus Canonicum*, III, §10 ; Beste, *Introductio in Codicem*, p. 729. Rectors of churches are bound, of course, to obey these episcopal injunctions in the manner determined by local regulations.

The eagerness of our questioner to have the collections as ordered is tempered by his experience, unhappily very general, that the ordinary parochial collection is always correspondingly lessened whenever a diocesan collection takes place, and that his just expectation of receiving the wherewithal for his support, and for parochial purposes, suffers some set-back. This raises the important question of what constitutes the *dos beneficii* and *fructus beneficalis* in an English parish which is entirely dependent on the offerings of the faithful, a matter which has often been discussed in this Review.¹ Now, if we accept, for the sake of argument, the untenable view that all the church collections belong to the beneficiary, the law nevertheless permits the Ordinary to make all kinds of demands upon this revenue : a contribution to the Seminary (canons 1505, 1355, 1356) ; cathedraticum (canon 1504) ; pensio beneficalis (canons 1505, 1429) exactio extraordinaria et moderata (canon 1505) ; tributum in bonum diocesis (canon 1506). Apart from the small *cathedraticum*, Ordinaries are not accustomed, we believe, to claim these rights in England. But they are accustomed to demand special collections for diocesan purposes, many of which, owing to the centralization universal in modern times, are for charities such as schools, orphanages, and other works which indirectly benefit the parish ; other diocesan collections, such as Peter's Pence, Foreign Missions and Holy Places, are made at the bidding of the Holy See, rather than on the authority of the Ordinary. Following the commentators, we have connected the right to order these collections with canon 1503 rather than with those canons which authorize demands on the fruits of a benefice. If, as may well be, the parochial revenue suffers heavily on these occasions, it could be explained to the people that the diocesan collection is something extra. A seminary professor is unskilled in such things, but it is possible, no doubt, to

¹ Cf. 1937, xiii, pp. 29-33 ; p. 72 ; 1938, xv, pp. 189-202, 376, 468, 562 ; 1939, xvi, pp. 84, 274.

find some means of obeying the episcopal injunctions whilst leaving intact the ordinary revenue of the parish.

E. J. M.

ORATIONES PRO DEFUNCTIS

What is the meaning to be given to "congregatio" in the second prayer of the *Missa Quotidiana*? May the prayer "pro parentibus" be used if they were non-Catholics?

REPLY

(i) The prayer "Deus veniae largitor" was originally found in monastic missals dating at least from the eleventh century, and referred in its original context to a Benedictine family or community. "Congregatio" has this meaning in the *Rule of St. Benedict*, as at the end of ch. iv, and in the title to ch. lxiii, "De ordine congregationis". Etymologically it can mean any assembly or group, a flock gathered together. The prayer has been in the Roman Missal since the fifteenth century, and persons reciting it may now give any meaning they choose to the word "congregatio", e.g. the people present, the parishioners, the members of a college. This is the explanation given by a writer in *Ephemerides Liturgicae*, 1928, p. 47.

(ii) From canon 2262 §2 one may deduce that Mass may be offered "privatim ac remoto scandalo" for non-Catholics. It would therefore seem evident that a prayer for them within the Mass is certainly permitted with the same reservations.

E. J. M.

DUPLICATION IN CONVENT CHAPEL

A community of fourteen religious, without enclosure, including one who is too infirm to leave the place, is served by a religious house, two minutes' walk from the convent, the superior of which possesses the faculty to permit duplication whenever necessary. If Mass is not said at the Convent, Holy Communion is given, and the majority of the sisters

are accustomed to come to the Church for a second Mass, whether Mass is said in their chapel or not. Is this a case where duplication is permitted by the common law? (R.)

REPLY

Canon 806 §2. Hanc tamen facultatem impertiri nequit Ordinarius, nisi cum, prudenti eius iudicio, propter penuriam sacerdotum die festo de praecepto notabilis fidelium pars Missae adstare non possit; non est autem in eius potestate plures quam duas Missas eidem sacerdoti permittere.

The terms of the law were discussed in this REVIEW, February 1940, p. 153, and it is apparent that practices are tolerated at the present day, which are, to say the least, a most liberal interpretation of the canon. The Ordinary is the person with whom a decision rests, and what we have to say is not by way of suggesting what he should or should not do. The point is rather to decide whether a priest, already in possession of the faculty, may use it with a good conscience in the above circumstances, without referring the case to the Ordinary's decision. The only argument which might favour the lawfulness of duplication, in the above circumstances, is that the Ordinary has given tacit consent, inasmuch as it is the custom to use duplication faculties in favour of a religious community; the commentators agree that a priest may follow the local custom in using his faculty. It will certainly be found that, in most cases of the kind, the community cannot hear Mass elsewhere *without grave inconvenience*, which is the meaning to be given to the words "non possit" in the canon. Thus Cappello, *De Sacramentis* Vol. I, n. 732: "... si monasterium, domus pia vel religiosa secus careret Missa, nec in ea commorantes possent sine gravi incommodo ad aliam ecclesiam accedere, nec adsit alius sacerdos". But we cannot detect, in the circumstances outlined above, anything which could be called a *grave incommodum*. Therefore, it is our opinion that the case should be referred to the Ordinary's decision, in order to discover whether or not it is considered to come within the common law.

E. J. M.

CHRISTIAN NAME IN ADULT BAPTISM

An adult convert, James Brown, desires to take the Christian name John at baptism. The parish priest, fearing subsequent confusion as to the man's identity, enters his name as James in the baptismal register. Is this correct? (S.)

REPLY

The common law of the Church, so far as we can discover, does not provide for this contingency. The baptismal register is a "public" document (canon 1813), and the obligation of inscribing it correctly (canon 777) has appropriate sanctions in canons 1813 and 2406 §1. The latter canon provides, amongst other things, against falsifying entries therein (*falsare, adulterare, destruere vel occultare*).

In the civil law a person may change his name as often as he sees fit, provided it is not done for illegal purposes. But in so doing he runs the risk of confusing his identity, thus endangering his rights to property and other things, and to avoid this risk the proper course is to execute a deed and have it enrolled at the Central Office of the Supreme Court of Judicature, or to publicize the change by announcement in the *London Gazette* and in the newspapers.

In order to avoid needless conflict between civil and ecclesiastical registers, the best course is for the adult convert to retain at baptism the Christian name which was entered in the civil register at the time of his birth. But there may be good reasons for a change; for example, the name may have profane or anti-Christian associations and, therefore, be contrary to the law of canon 761. In this case we think that the original name should also be inscribed in the register, together with the Christian name, in order to avoid subsequent confusion. This procedure is of obligation in some dioceses as in Malines: "*Quod si baptizandus infans sub profano aliquo nomine in registris status civilis inscriptus iam fuerit, nomen alicuius e Coelitibus ei imponatur. Nomen tamen profanum simul cum alio vel aliis in libro baptismali notetur, ne ex nominum diversitate*

postea dubium oriatur de infantis identitate".¹ If this course is followed, every subsequent extract from the register should indicate both names, e.g. "Joannes (*in registro civili* Jacobus) Brown". Alternatively, the person could be advised to adopt the procedure for changing his name as already indicated, but in our view a double entry in the baptismal register suffices in the circumstances.

E. J. M.

EX-RELIGIOUS IN MINOR ORDERS

A religious in an exempt clerical Institute received the tonsure and minor orders whilst under temporary vows. The time of these vows being expired the Superiors would not permit him to renew them or to make his perpetual profession. Since he desires to proceed to the priesthood, what rights has he got against the Institute which dismissed him? If he has none, what is his position as a cleric? (W.)

REPLY

The situation with regard to a dismissed religious is clearly provided for in Canon Law. A refusal to permit vows to be renewed at their expiration is spoken of above as "dismissal", which is incorrect. Dismissal is lawful, in the case of a religious under temporary vows not yet expired, when the procedure (grave reasons and the rest) of Canon 647 has been duly observed. From §2.4 of this canon the religious has the right of recourse to the Holy See, and pending a decision the dismissal is of no effect. If his recourse is unsuccessful the dismissal takes effect and he is reduced to the lay state from Canon 648: "*ipso facto solvitur ab omnibus votis religiosus . . . clericus autem in minoribus ordinibus constitutus eo ipso redactus est in statum laicalem*".

But there is a difference between leaving a religious Institute on the expiration of vows and being dismissed from

¹ *Statuta Dioecesis Mechliniensis* (1924) n. 243.

it. In the latter case a grave cause is required, in the former merely just and reasonable causes (Canon 637); in the latter case a cleric in minor orders is *ipso facto* reduced to the lay state, in the former case this is not expressly contained in the law; in the latter case Canon 647 §2.4 provides for recourse "in suspensivo" to the Holy See, in the former there is no such provision. Has then a religious no remedy if he considers that he has been prevented unjustly and unreasonably from renewing his vows? Certainly, he has the right which every member of the Church possesses of appealing to the Holy See to remedy a supposed injustice. But seeing that the law gives the religious superiors the widest discretion in refusing a renewal of vows, we are of the opinion that the chance of any appeal succeeding is so slight as to be negligible, except only in the case mentioned in Canon 637, namely, when renewal of vows is refused owing to ill-health which was not concealed before the emission of temporary vows. If the appeal is successful the religious would be reinstated in the Institute, but pending a decision he must leave it; unlike the appeal of a dismissed religious, under Canon 647 §2, an appeal against the decision taken by superiors in Canon 637 is not "in suspensivo" but "in devolutivo".

A religious in major orders who, for any reason, is lawfully severed from his Institute, is governed by Canons 641, 642, 648, but the status of one in minor orders is not clearly defined by the Code. It cannot be said with certainty that he is reduced *ipso facto* to the lay state, unless he has been dismissed from the Institute; and if he is still a cleric, it appears that he must belong to some Ordinary, from Canon 111.

One view is that he comes under the jurisdiction of the Ordinary of his domicile or quasi-domicile, not indeed with that dependence which arises from incardination, but on a par with the rest of the faithful, from Canon 94. This Ordinary has the power to reduce him to the lay state from Canon 211 §2.¹

Another view is that he becomes incardinated to the diocese to which he belonged before entering the religious

¹ *L'Ami du Clergé*, 1939, p. 509.
Vol. xix.

Institute, and the Ordinary may reduce him to the lay state, or receive him amongst his own clerics, or excardinate him to another diocese.¹

Neither of these views seems correct, since it is not equitable that an Ordinary should be burdened with the responsibility of disposing of a cleric, for whose entry into the clerical state he was in no way responsible. Moreover, under Canon 94, the ex-religious would have the choice of more than one Ordinary, whereas the diocese of incardination, from Canon 211 §2, is that diocese for the service of which a cleric becomes ascribed by receiving the tonsure, a description which by no means fits the above case. Our opinion is that this cleric is reduced to the lay state on leaving his Institute, just as though he had been dismissed.²

If this ex-religious is unwilling to regard himself as reduced to the lay state, he must find an Ordinary willing to receive him and promote him to major orders, observing *mutatis mutandis* the terms of Canon 212 §1. There is not, strictly speaking, any injustice in his position, since no one has any right to ordination, and not being in major orders he has no claim on any Ordinary for the means of subsistence.

E.J.M.

¹ Cf. Beste, *Introductio in Codicem*, p. 172.

² Palombo, *De Demissione Religiosorum*, n. 214.

ROMAN DOCUMENTS

SACRA CONGREGATIO RITUUM

I

BENEDICTIO NOSOCOMIORUM ALIARUMQUE DOMORUM AEGROTIS
CURANDIS (A.A.S. xxxii, 1940, p. 197.)

Ant. Omnes male habéntes Christus curávit; ipse infirmitátes nostras accépit, et ægrotatiónes nostras portávit (*Matth.*, VIII, 17).

Ps. 6. Dómine, ne in furóre tuo arguas me* neque in ira tua corripas me.

Miserére mei, Dómine : quóniam infirmus sum : * sana me, Dómine, quóniam conturbáta sunt ossa mea.

Et ánima mea turbáta est valde : * sed tu, Dómine, úsquequo ?

Convértere, Dómine, et éripe ánimam meam : * salvum me fac propter misericórdiam tuam.

Quóniam non est in morte qui memor sit tui : * in inférno autem quis confitébitur tibi ?

Laborávi in gémitu meo, lavábo per síngulas noctes lectum meum : * lácrimis meis stratum meum rigábo.

Turbátus est a furóre óculus meus : * inveterávi inter omnes inimícos meos.

Discédite a me omnes qui operámini iniquitátem : * quóniam exaudivit Dóminus vocem fletus mei.

Exaudivit Dóminus deprecationem meam : * Dóminus orationem meam suscepit.

Erubéscant et conturbéntur veheménter omnes inimíci mei : * convertántur et erubéscant valde velóciter.

Glória Patri, etc.

Repetitur Antiphona.

℣. Adjutórium nostrum in nómine Dómini.

℟. Qui fecit cælum et terram.

℣. Dóminus vobíscum.

℟. Et cum spíritu tuo.

Orémus

Deus qui mirablliter hóminem creásti, et mirabllius reformásti, atque váriis infirmitátibus, quibus humana fraglitas detinétur, múltiplici remédio succurrere dignátus es; tuam sanctam benedictionem super hanc domum benignus infúnde, ut ægrórum, huc adveniéntium, córpori et ánimæ ipse medeáris, tua eos patérna pietáte custódias, ac post vitæ cursum ad gáudia transférás sempitérna. Per Christum Dóminum nostrum.

R/. Amen.

Orémus

Dómine Jesu Christe, infirmitátis nostræ solámen et salus, qui Petri socrum et Réguli filium a magnis fébribus liberásti, paralýticum roborásti, leprósos mundasti, Centuriónis púerum sanásti, mulierem a fluxu sánguinis salvásti, ad piscinam jacéntem lánguidum erexísti, civitátes et castélla circúmiens omnem languórem et infirmitátem curásti: benedíc, quæsumus, et sanctífica domum istam; ut omnes infirmi hic moratúri, ab omni ægritúdine leváti, mentis et córporis sanitáte donáti, poténtiam tuam perpétuo váleant collaudáre. Qui vivis et regnas in sæcula sæculórum.

R/. Amen.

Deinde aspergit præcipua nosocomii loca Aqua benedicta et subjungit :

V. Osténde nobis, Dómine, misericórdiam tuam.

R/. Et salutáre tuum da nobis.

V. Dómine, exáudi orationem meam.

R/. Et clamor meus ad te véniat.

V. Dóminus vobíscum.

R/. Et cum spíritu tuo.

Orémus.

Omnípotens sempitérne Deus, qui ægritúdines animárum depéllis et córporum, auxílii tui super infirmos osténde

virtutem, ut ope misericordiae tuae ad omnia pietatis tuae reparantur officia.

Concede nos famulos tuos, quæsumus, Domine Deus, perpetua mentis et corporis sanitate gaudere, et, gloriosa beatae Mariae semper Virginis intercessione, a praesenti liberari tristitia et aeterna perfrui laetitia.

Deus qui nos miro Angelorum ministerio custodis et gubernas, huic quoque domui Angelum tuum deputa custodem, qui ab ea omnes repellat potestates; ut aegroti in ea jacentes ab omni formidine et perturbatione protecti, pristinae reddantur sanitati.

Deus, qui ineffabili providentia beatum Joseph sanctissimae Genitricis tuae Sponsum eligere dignatus es; praesta quæsumus; ut quem protectorem veneramur in terris, intercessorem habere mereamur in caelis. Deus, misericordiarum Pater, per merita et intercessionem Sanctorum Camilli et Joannis de Deo, quos viscera misericordiae indutos, infirmorum adiutores et consolatores effectisti: aegrotis in hac domo curandis propitius adesse digneris; ut a corporis languoribus erepti, animi moeroribus sublevati, ad pristinam redeant sanitatem et debitas misericordiae tuae gratiarum jüger referant actiones. Per Christum Dominum nostrum.

R. Amen.

URBIS ET ORBIS

Instante Revmo P. Praefecto Generali Clericorum Regularium Infirmis Ministrantium, Sacra Rituum Congregatio, vigore facultatum sibi specialiter a Sanctissimo Domino nostro Pio Papa XII tributarum, suprascriptam formulam benedictionis Nosocomiorum aliarumque domorum aegrotis curandis, probavit et adhibendam benigne concessit. Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque.

Die 18 Iulii 1939.

C. Card. SALOTTI, *Praefectus*.

II

RITUS BENEDICTIONIS PAPALIS SUPER POPULUM ELARGIENDAE
SERVANDUS A SACERDOTIBUS, QUIBUS A S. SEDE HUIUSMODI
FACULTAS INDULTA EST (A.A.S. xxxii, 1940, p. 199)

1. *Admoneatur populus de ecclesia, die et hora, qua dabitur pontificia Benedictio. Postquam populus ad ecclesiam convenerit ad contritionis et devotionis sensus pio brevique sermone excitetur. Mox vero Sacerdos, nullis circumstantibus ministris, superpelliceo et stola alba indutus, ante altare genuflexus, sequentibus versibus Dei opem imploret.*

Y. Adjutórium nostrum in nómine Dómini.

R. Qui fecit cœlum et terram.

Y. Salvum fac pópulum tuum, Dómine.

R. Et bédedic hereditáti tuæ.

Y. Dóminus vobíscum.

R. Et cum spíritu tuo.

Deinde stans sequentem recitet orationem :

Oratio

Omnípotens et miséricors Deus, da nobis auxílium de sancto, et vota pópuli huius, in humilitáte cordis véniam peccatórum poscéntis tuámque benedictiónem præstolántis et grátiam, cleménter exáudi : dexteram tuam super eum benígnus exténde, ac plenitúdinem divínæ benedíctionis effúnde, qua, bonis ómnibus cumulátus, felicitátem et vitam consequátur ætéram. Per Christum Dóminum nostrum.

R. Amen.

2. *Postea ad cornu Epistolæ accedat ; ibique stans, una benedictione, unico videlicet signo crucis, benedicat, proferens alta voce hæc verba :*

Benedicat vos omnípotens Deus, Pater, et Fílius, et Spíritus Sanctus. Amen.

3. *Sacerdotes qui facultate gaudent impertiendi Benedictiorem Papalem formulam præscriptam servant ; hac facultate non utantur nisi in designata ecclesia ; non autem eodem die et loco quo Episcopus eam impertiat.*

URBIS ET ORBIS

Cum ex benigna Summi Pontificis concessione Sacra Paenitentiaría Apostolice, peculiaribus in adiunctis et circumstantiis extra ordinem concurrentibus, facultatem

Benedictionem Papalem una cum Indulgentia plenaria impertiendi sacerdotibus concedere soleat, Eñus et Rñus D. Cardinalis Lauri, Sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae Camerarius et Paenitentiarius Maior, Sacram hanc Rituum Congregationem rogavit ut formulam, qua praefata Papalis Benedictio fidelibus impertiri posset, statuere dignaretur.

Sacra autem Rituum Congregatio, prae oculis habens ritum, qui in ipso Rituali Romano (tit. VIII cap 32) invenitur, Regularibus utique concessum, Benedictiois Apostolicae statis diebus super populum elargiendae, audito Specialis Commissionis Liturgicae suffragio, huius ritus formulam in posterum ab omnibus sacerdotibus, sive saecularibus sive regularibus, qui speciali Sedis Apostolicae gaudent Indulto Benedictioem Papalem cum Indulgentia plenaria elargiendi adhibendam ac servandam esse retinuit.

Facta autem supra his omnibus ab infrascripto Cardinali Sacrorum Rituum Congregationis Praefecto relatione Sanctissimo Domino Nostro Pio Papae XII, die 6 Martii 1940, Sanctitas Sua votum Sacrae Congregationis benigne approbavit illudque publici iuris fieri mandavit. Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque.

Datum Romae ex Sacra Rituum Congregatione, die 12 Martii a. 1940.

✱ C. Card. SALOTTI, Episc. Praenest., *Praefectus*.

There are no less than seven separate formulae for granting the Papal or Apostolic Benediction with plenary indulgence attached.

(i) The solemn blessing of the Pope himself given publicly on special occasions from the portico of St. Peter's, or privately to individuals who seek it. The papal practice of granting this favour through the mediation of others is the basis upon which all the other formulae rest.

(ii) From the common law of canon 914, bishops, abbots and other prelates may impart it twice yearly, namely, on Easter Sunday and on another solemn festival at choice. The *formula* is in the appendix to the *Roman Pontifical*.

(iii) From the common law of canon 468 §2, any priest assisting the dying may concede it *in articulo mortis*. The formula, with a shortened version for cases of necessity, is in *Rituale Romanum*, tit, v., cap. vi.

(iv) Priests who have obtained an Apostolic Indult for the purpose may give the blessing in *fine concionum* with the formula in the Appendix to *Rituale Romanum, Benedictiones Reservatae*, II, n.4. Cf. CLERGY REVIEW, 1940, Vol. xviii, p. 343.

(v) Regulars usually obtain the privilege, mentioned in canon 915, of granting this blessing to their own congregations, with certain limitations as to time and place, using the formula I in *Rituale Romanum*, tit, viii, cap. 33.

(vi) Directors of tertiaries may obtain a similar privilege for their subjects, using formula II in *Rituale Romanum*, tit, viii, cap. 33.

(vii) Finally, regulars possessing an indult may grant the blessing, with certain limitations and conditions, not merely to their congregations and tertiaries but to the people in general—"super populum"—with the formula in *Rituale Romanum*, tit. viii, cap. 32. Similar indults are often obtained by any priest, but no special formula existed for granting the blessing, and writers often recommended the one in *fine concionum*, n. iv supra. The *Congregation of Rites* has now issued a formula which is identical with the "super populum" formula of *Rituale Romanum*, tit, viii, cap. 32. except for the rubrics which are modified and no longer read as applicable only to regulars.

Future typical editions of the Ritual will, no doubt, print the new formula in place of the one in the present edition.

If it is asked why there are so many formulae for what is, in effect, the same thing, the answer must be sought in the fact that it is a question of granting an indulgence. Innumerable indulgences granted at different times and for different reasons are in existence, and many of them are almost identical in substance, e.g., those attached to the various scapulars and rosaries. Similarly, the papal blessing, originally the personal act of the Pope, has been granted at different times, to different persons and for different reasons.

E. J. M.

CHURCH MANAGEMENT

THE PRIEST AND HIS CHOIR—I

MANY years ago a book under the above title was planned by the editors of the Westminster Library. It never saw the light. The appointed writer, trying his notes on students by way of a lecture, declared that the choir was the most likely rock on which a priest might split his parish. On the other hand, it may be reasonably argued that a good choir can be the mainstay of parochial life.

There are small isolated parishes where, for obvious reasons, High Mass is unknown ; but there are also big parishes in towns where not so much as an ordinary Missa Cantata is ever heard. It is true that there is no obligation ; but has anyone ever heard a convincing argument in defence of the omission ? Undeniably there is a dullness about the religious life of parishes where Mass is never sung, and in big parishes many of the faithful feel that something is lacking when not one of the several Masses on Sunday is sung. That Mother Church herself expects us to distinguish the Sunday, where it can be done, by some little solemnity over and above Low Mass is surely attested by the almost universal custom of Catholic countries.

In any parish it should be possible to collect a sufficient number of passable voices to form a simple but serviceable choir. Few of us are expert musicians ; but during our long years of training most of us acquire sufficient taste and knowledge of the Church's requirements in the matter of music to qualify us to direct the training and the functioning. It is impossible to run a good choir without the co-operation of a competent organist, and on the whole it is better that he should be paid, even though the stipend be only a modest honorarium. Voluntary organists are inclined to be unreliable and to want to manage things entirely their own way. It is desirable that the organist should live in the parish or at no great distance. The employment of non-Catholic organists is to be discountenanced. An honorary choirmaster of the right sort can be an invaluable helper ; he should be more of a leader than a driver, and one who is not unwilling to receive advice or suggestions.

A church of cathedral dignity, where the full observance of the offices demands long hours of attendance on the part of the choir, must inevitably be dependent, partly at least, upon the services of paid singers of professional or semi-professional qualifications. Apart from this exceptional case, a parish, no matter how small, must be in a very poor way if it cannot produce a sufficiency of singers willing to devote their voices to the honour and glory of God. The employment of paid singers in a parish church is open to many objections. It is apt to give the impression that the musical programme is meant to be the attraction, and that the singing is more important than the liturgy. If it be pleaded in apology that some of the singers have a long way to come and are therefore at least entitled to their expenses, an appropriate reply would be to ask why they do not offer their services to their own parish priest. And if to this it is answered that their own parish priest cannot afford to pay them, the chief objection to paid parochial choirs becomes immediately plain.

What has been said about non-Catholic organists applies even more forcibly to non-Catholic singers. One can admit that there are rare exceptions, as, for example, in the case of a well-meaning husband who has inclinations towards the Faith ; but ordinarily the spectacle of a non-Catholic taking part by singing in that most sacred and intimate rite, the Holy Sacrifice, is best described by the very neat but scarcely translatable term, *dedecens*.

J. P. R.

BOOK REVIEWS

Italian Nationalism and English Letters. By Harry W. Rudman. Pp. 444. (Allen and Unwin. 18s.)

IN the year 1823 an Italian poet in exile acquired seven hundred pounds by lecturing in Italian to English audiences : this was Ugo Foscolo. In 1864 the Duchess of Sutherland's housemaids increased their emoluments to some degree unknown by selling little bottles of soapsuds said to come from the basin of a distinguished guest—this was Garibaldi. These two incidents, whose financial setting is not inapposite, are typical of a whole epoch of enthusiasms which has passed almost entirely from our national memory and is now dispassionately evoked in this detailed and documented book.

Mr. Rudman is chiefly interested in the relations between the political activity of Italian refugees and the literary activity of English poets and novelists. Contact between the chief figures on either side was not particularly frequent. True, Mazzini saw a good deal of the Carlyles and probably an excess of Swinburne (whose somewhat embarrassing worship he rewarded with the gift of an Angora cat). But Foscolo was intimate with no English poets more eminent than Samuel Rogers ; and the Brownings, Landor, Tennyson, Wilkie Collins and Dickens, whose work in various ways shows a considerable debt to Italy, do not appear from this study to have had much first-hand intercourse with exiled Italians. Hence there are fewer personal anecdotes here than one might have hoped, and rather more than one desires in the way of record and analysis of third-rate poems and novels on Italian subjects.

Mr. Rudman has clearly seen the variety of motives which led so many Victorians to embrace so eagerly the aspirations of the Risorgimento. On the one hand (as so often before and since) a genuine humanitarianism ; on the other, political and commercial interests of a dubious kind, and a very considerable No-Popery impulse. The crowded audiences listening to an apostate friar ; Lord Shaftesbury and his hopes of a Protestant Italy ; the young ladies of quality reading the *Inferno* under some exile's

guidance and rejoicing in Gabriele Rossetti's discovery that Dante's Satan and the Pope were quite simply one and the same person—such figures as these naturally did and do much to alienate Catholic sympathies from the general movement of the Risorgimento. But it must certainly be admitted that Catholics on their side were deficient in understanding, and Manning did little service to the Church when he pronounced that Italian unity was "in direct conflict with the providential order by which Christendom has been sustained for these thousand years".

It is much to be desired that the whole story of the Risorgimento should be retold by a serious historian possessing the same sympathy for the traditional Catholic background which has been shown by Bacchelli in his fictional trilogy of the period (*Il mulino del Po*). Meanwhile, Mr. Rudman's judgement on Garibaldi, though written in terms of the Left, is at least more penetrating than Trevelyan's :

"He was the first of the 'shirts', who plague us during these difficult times ; he revived the Italian habit of marching on Rome ; and he did believe in dictatorships—though solely of a temporary kind. Nevertheless, in memory of his aid to the third French Republic, there was a 'Garibaldi' brigade fighting with the international anti-Fascistic forces against the Spanish rebels (1937-38). The name assumed by the foregoing military contingent, composed of Italians in exile, is appropriate, for the man thus commemorated had, about 1871, welcomed the First International as the 'rising sun of the future'."

As they say in the B.B.C. discussions, perhaps we can leave it at that.

W. S.

Boethius. By Helen M. Barrett. Large Crown 8vo. Pp. ix+179. (Cambridge University Press. 7s. 6d.)

ANICIUS MANLIUS TORQUATUS SEVERINUS BOETHIUS (to give him his full name), known in the martyrology of Pavia as Saint Severinus, is the last great representative of Roman philosophy before the end of the patristic age. Born of

exalted Roman parents, he studied widely, and later obtained various important administrative appointments under Theodoric the Ostrogoth who had seized the reins of power in Italy while the Western Empire was crumbling to its final disruption. The noble Roman student eventually became Magister Officiorum, the head of the Civil Service in the government of the barbarian invader, but fell under suspicion of treason, and was imprisoned, tortured and executed by his ruthless master probably in 523 or 524.

Boethius was accused of protecting another senator who was engaged in what Theodoric regarded as a treasonable correspondence with the Eastern Emperor Justin, and was himself accused of Byzantine sympathies. The issue was not merely political, though Miss Barrett insists on regarding it as such, for Justin was an orthodox Catholic while Theodoric was an heretical Arian. It was on these grounds that the execution of Boethius was exalted to the rank of martyrdom and he was honoured as a Saint, a cultus which was sanctioned by the Sacred Congregation of Rites for the diocese of Pavia in 1883. It is not, therefore, entirely true to say (p. 50) that "the old tradition has long been abandoned that he died a Catholic martyr at the hands of a persecuting Arian king".

While he was in prison awaiting death Boethius wrote his most celebrated work, *De Consolatione Philosophiae*, a treatise on the true joys of philosophy, cast in dialogue form, which obtained widespread popularity throughout the Middle Ages. It has been suggested that in writing, under the very shadow of death, a defence of philosophy in which there is no mention of Christ or revealed religion, Boethius betrays the true cast of his own mind. He was at heart a pagan philosopher rather than a Christian believer. Miss Barrett rejects the accusation, and puts forward a novel explanation of the author's true attitude. She brings out clearly also the value of the lesser-known but in some ways more valuable theological works in which are many of the famous definitions later to be used and expanded with such profit by St. Thomas and the scholastic theologians. Her book has been written with careful and judicious sympathy, and she has succeeded in reconstructing a convincing if

somewhat slight picture of the troubled years of the early sixth century, and of the man who, though suffering perhaps from conscious self-righteousness, has left a noble example of fortitude, and has an enviable title to remembrance as the last of the Romans and the first of the scholastics.

A. B.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE DECREE *CONSILIUM SUUM CONSEQUENS*

Fr. More O'Farrall writes :

The current issue of the CLERGY REVIEW refers us to the April 1940 issue, where it is stated that the decree *Consilium suum consequens* is not retrospective. But, in response to many queries, the Secretary of the Irish C.T.S. stated that priests who joined that Society between 17 June, 1931 and 1 April, 1933, were not able (1) "to bless with the sign of Cross, Rosaries of the Blessed Virgin . . . and to apply to them an Indulgence of 500 days . . . ; (2) to bless . . . crucifixes and to apply to them a Plenary Indulgence, which can be gained when dying . . ."

It is regrettable that some members of the Irish C.T.S. ceased membership on account of the alleged effect of the papal decree.

Canon Mahoney replies :

It is quite certain that, in the common law, those *priests* who had obtained certain faculties by the act of joining some association such as the *Catholic Truth Society* before 1 April, 1933, were not deprived of their powers by the decree ; in other words the decree is not retrospective. Assuming that the reply of the Secretary is authentic, it seems to me that he must have been answering a query concerning the retention of these privileges by clerics who were members of the Society, but not *priest* members before 1 April, 1933. His answer is based on an interpretation of the decree given by a highly placed Roman authority, and mentioned in this REVIEW, 1934, Vol. VII, p. 435. It is

not so easy to suggest a reason for the date, 17 June, 1931, but conceivably it was not till then that the privileges (since abolished) were obtained by the Society for its members.

Inasmuch as the theory of Indulgences largely rests on the principle that the faithful will be led to do some pious work precisely in order to qualify for the privileges, I cannot agree that it is very regrettable that priests who, rightly or wrongly, have no particular interest in a pious association, except as the dispenser of favours, decide to withdraw their membership when the favours are withdrawn. Instead of taking the trouble and going to the slight expense of becoming or remaining members of a favour-dispensing association, all they have to do now is to take the trouble and go to the slight expense of applying through their Ordinaries for whatever faculties they desire to obtain from the Holy See.

UNIQUE CEREMONIES MUCH NEGLECTED

A "Priest of 46 years' standing" writes :

Many of us priests who for years have been called upon to perform the sacred ceremonies of Holy Week have not seldom been distressed on Holy Saturday morning by the small attendance of the faithful at the beautiful and deeply significant blessings of the Easter Fire and the Paschal Candle. Originally they were performed in the evening, and were meant to provide a dignified illumination first for the Deacon and the Celebrant, and then for the rest of the Church during the Easter Night services.

Circumstances have changed the customary time, so that now we anticipate the "truly blessed night" early on Saturday morning. The unusual early hour is not favourable for the attendance of the faithful, but it is chosen so as to have Holy Mass celebrated at an hour convenient for the Communion of the people, and also to give more time both to the busy priests and to the sacristans and others for the cleaning and decoration of the church. As the ancient and significant lessons are attractive only to a few interested and leisured people, most of the faithful who are able to attend at all arrive perhaps just in time for the blessing of

the Font. This custom is laudable as far as it goes, but it raises the question : Could not something be done to procure a better attendance at the first two blessings ?

The fact that holy Church insists on retaining them, even in small parish churches, shows that she would wish the faithful to be instructed and impressed by these ancient and venerable functions. Instruction is indeed provided by the Holy Week books which are now in so many Catholic hands. But the faithful would be more impressed by hearing the chants and seeing the ceremonies of the "Lumen Christi" and the "Praeconium Paschale", and they would behold the lighting of the Paschal Candle during the forty days and its extinction on Ascension Day with greater interest and devotion.

If the two blessings, instead of preceding the twelve lessons, were following them, we should undoubtedly secure a larger attendance. The lessons themselves, like those on Whitsun Eve, do not really need a preparatory ceremony, and they are now not necessarily read by the blest Easter light. Perhaps our Hierarchy might obtain from the Holy See permission to allow this alteration for the benefit of the faithful. If this faculty were granted at the discretion of the Right Reverend Ordinaries there would be no danger of abuse or of confusion amongst the people. What is the opinion of your reverend readers ?

As my personality is of no weight or importance, I sign myself as above.

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

